The Dissertation Committee for Paul André Bonin Certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

Artists' Material Practices: The Ideology of Funding and Support for Independent Performing Artists

Committee:

Jill Dolan, Supervisor

Ann Daly

Richard Flores

Sharon Grady

Stacy Wolf

Artists' Material Practices: The Ideology of Funding and Support for Independent Performing Artists

by

Paul André Bonin, B.A.; M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2006

Dedication

To Richard Henry (“Hank”) Lee, with love and gratitude.

Acknowledgements

With respect to scholarship, I have benefited from the attentions of a generous and talented faculty, as well as my colleagues, in the Performance as Public Practice Program. I offer special thanks to Professors Jill Dolan and Ann Daly, who guided me throughout the dissertation process offering both feedback and insight. Two colleagues were consistently present during my writing: Zachary Dorsey is a friend and dramaturg who combed through each chapter and engaged me in conversation about substance and form; Susanne Shawyer gave important editorial comments. As always, my artist-citizen-activist colleague Jaclyn Pryor offered insight, especially with respect to BREAD.

My material practice theorizing was informed by the many artists who speak in this dissertation, but especially my colleagues at Jump-Start Performance Co. in San Antonio. I thank the National Performance Network for allowing me to attend so many conferences. I thank the National Association for Latino Arts and Culture for responding to my requests for materials.

My scholarship was made possible by the Ford Foundation Predoctoral Fellowship for Minority Fellows, which subsidized three years of graduate study. My extended time on campus during candidacy was made possible by two appointments as a T.A. to Professor Jose Limón at the Center for Mexican-American Studies.

I am grateful to these friends who supported me and/or housed me during my time in Austin, Ted Smith, Gustavo de Veciana, John Walch, Greg Barbutti, Kathy Schmidt, and Tasha Beretvas. I am grateful to my friends and family, Charles and Sylvia Bonin, Stephen Bonin, Carlos Rodriguez, Jan and Julius Tollas, Ralph May, Margo and Fitz Lee, Ginny Williams, Margie Shackelford and Alex Caragonne, Heather Hunter, Steve Bailey, and Sterling Houston for their ongoing support and interest in my work.

Mostly, I am grateful to Hank Lee, my partner who stood by me “through all the hard times and all the unknowns” and who continues to teach me daily what love and faith mean.

Artists' Material Practices: The Ideology of Funding
and Support for Independent Performing Artists

Publication No._____

Paul André Bonin, Ph.D.
The University of Texas at Austin, 2006

Supervisor: Jill Dolan

This dissertation asks how systems of support for independent performing artists account for their artistic processes as well as the products they create. I examine artists' material practices through the texts and contexts that structure their lives—namely, historically-informed cultural policy issues, artist support organizations, and artist support mechanisms as diverse as grants, collaborations, and spectatorship. These material practices channel the flow of capital (social, financial, cultural, and intellectual) in artists' lives so that physical, emotional, and spiritual needs are met. I believe that these texts and contexts hold a few very basic meanings that govern the work and lives of independent artists and that these basic meanings are forgotten in the habituation of practice.

My research takes a cultural studies approach, applying economic and social theory and the stories of independent artists, including myself, to analyze four operational modes in the field of performance. Each model is derived from a specific type of

material practice: networking, needs-based cultural policy, public and private support, and individual entrepreneurialism. For each mode, I examine the root word for the practice: "network," "need," "support," and "entrepreneur." For each word, the work of one organization illustrates effectively, though not exclusively, how the practices are applied: the National Performance Network ("network"), the Urban Institute and Leveraging Investments in Creativity (LINC) ("need"), the National Association of Latino Arts and Cultures ("support"), and the Creative Capital Foundation ("entrepreneur"). Many of these practices occur in a space that is referred to as "behind the scenes." For me, "behind the scenes" is too local to capture the many resources available to artists. I use the term "and everything else" to refer to artists' practices performed around production with production in mind. As an activist, an independent performing artist, and a scholar, I am committed to finding ways to illuminate artists' material concerns when (or even between) making work and making a living.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Prologue

"It's all about illusion!"

A former ballet teacher of mine used that comment to address the apparent effortlessness by which we dancers were expected to execute multiple lifts, turns, and jumps—with a smile and a grace that belied the grueling physical costs and the need to let our chests heave freely. I continued to hear his lesson in different way as I moved from dancing to performance art. A longtime director taught me to "pull back" during emotional moments onstage. "It's not about you," he said. "Hold back your emotions, and the audience will lean in. If you let go (and weep), they will distance themselves." A fellow performer said: "when you go onstage, imagine yourself a wizard weaving a spell. With an imaginary wand, you raise the audience up, up, up. Do not drop your spell till that final moment before the bow."

These messages about illusion, about hiding, about prolonging the unreal onstage came to imbue my life offstage as well. I used to say that I made my first full-length solo performance piece, *Talk of the Town*, for less than $100, and that $100 began my career as an independent performance artist. Part of the $100 paid for two Dairy Queen baseball caps, which cost me $16. My friend John Shinal took the promotional photos *gratis*. Film and processing cost about $45 total. My friend Steve Lawing did the poster layout for free. I spent $24 for flyer replication. I circulated fliers on my own at bars and restaurants throughout town. I sent out 200 personal letters inviting people to come to my show. Stamps at that time cost .29, so I spent $54 on stamps. My grandmother Otila Rodriguez provided the envelopes, which she had gotten on sale at Walgreens, most likely with the senior citizen discount she loved to use. She helped me stuff and stamp

all the envelopes. Onstage, in addition to some old jeans and tennis shoes, I wore a new t-shirt from the Gap, which I got on the sale table for $8.

In February 1992, on the first two nights of my first full-length solo show at Jump-Start Performance Co. in San Antonio, I drew crowds of 98 and 97, respectively. Because the theater had only 50 chairs, many audience members sat on carpet squares spread along the apron of the stage. I split the box office revenue with the theater after we had deducted for costs. My take was about $600. I paid the lighting designer, Max Parrilla, $150 with the receipts from my first show. I asked my friend Ginny Williams, an art collector, to give me $300 to pay for the production and editing of a video, and she did. I used to say that I spent $100 to make my first show, but these expenses add up to $897, while the income (including Ginny's contribution) adds up to $900. At first glance, I broke even when making my first show; however, were I to consider the budget holistically, I would find shortcomings.

These expenses do not account for the all the financial costs I excused, misplaced, or just plain hid when I bragged about making a piece for under $100. Nor do they account for the labors of friends and family who gave time, expertise, and devotion. Such assistance would no doubt include the time and efforts of my grandmother, who was once a secretary, and my friends, John and Steve, who worked as the photographer and graphic artist, respectively. Labor costs would also include the time spent writing 200 letters to spectators (for the first run), the subsequent letters to theaters and spectators, the video replication, the press packets, and the postage for all the theaters where I proposed work. They would include the trip to North Carolina I made in August 1991 to attend Alternate ROOTS, a meeting of community-based artists who have formed a core of influence for me. At ROOTS, I shared my work-in-progress with a number of performance artists and critics, including Tim Miller, Keith Antar-Mason,

Katherine Griffith, Keith Hennesey, Jane Goldberg, Linda Burnham, and Ann Kilkelly. After ROOTS, Tim made it possible for me to perform at Highways Performance Space in Santa Monica, CA, in November, on a mixed-bill of queer-themed work titled "Five Sleazy Pieces." I paid for my transportation and expenses, and Highways provided the housing. Tim gave me rides to and from the airport. I split the box office earnings with Highways and the four other performers. I made less than $100, but I secured a slot for the following summer in Highway's Ecce Lesbo/Ecce Homo Performance Festival, a prominent festival of queer work where I gained much cultural and social capital. I met a producer from a popular television show. When I returned to Highways with the full-length version of my production, he asked for my largely narrative writings—essentially staged short stories—and sent them to Random House. I was invited to deliver a book. Overwhelmed by the task, I never did deliver the book—or, haven't yet.

My $100 story does not take into account the work of Jump-Start's artists and administrators, especially Steve Bailey, who managed the theater from its inception and who has been a long-term collaborator for me. Nor do my expenses take into account the contract that I turned down the day after my show closed in San Antonio in February 1992. Jump-Start had offered me a second run in April, but I was scheduled to rejoin the Colorado Ballet Company for a tour of *Swan Lake*, and the show would have conflicted with my dancing. Finally, the expenses did not include a day I spent with Tim Miller in Houston in January 1992, reading with apologetic tones from my still-in-progress script, as he told me repeatedly, "keep going, Paul, it's lovely; it works."

Economists are fond to point out that artists' labors are alienable from them. The aesthetics of a work of art—what Marx once referred to as "congealed labor"—are generally not meant to show the efforts of their creation. Or, when they do, they become prized, evidence of the reality that bridges the visceral experience of art to the "real"

world. The particular gouge in a woodcarving, the tension in an opera singer's fingers, and the sweat on a performer's brow become the ephemera that marks the artist's effort, a symbol of their gift to spectators. Jill Dolan describes the work of performance artist Peggy Shaw in her autobiographical solo show, *Menopausal Gentleman*, in such a way:

In her choreographed physicality, [Shaw] demonstrates the labor of gender, even if she insists she's "so queer [she] doesn't have to talk about it." What she performs is the sweat required not only to flush hormonal changes through an aging female body, but the hard work of "being a gentleman in menopause" (*Utopia* 53).

In the moment Dolan describes, Shaw performs Shaw, and the sweat points out her contribution to the structure of feeling that attends this shared moment of performance.

As a performer who is a frequent spectator, I often watch shows and wonder about the well-being of my colleagues. After a show—or perhaps backstage during a performance—I often get to hear about my colleagues' struggles and successes as they (we) accrue financial, social, cultural, and intellectual capital. The different forms of capital embodied in French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu's system of accrual and expense help explain a performer's material existence.

I have known my colleagues to speak with clarity about the condition of the nation, the practices of a theater, the problems of a granting process, and the difficulty in getting adequate health insurance—i.e. the kind that will stick with someone after s/he has gotten sick.

I have received personal requests for money and other assistance when another performer in my field succumbed to an illness without having adequate insurance, if any at all. I have been the person in need of public health assistance. I have received calls and emails from colleagues requesting rent money, requesting references, requesting

intercession with a presenter who had talked a performer out of taking money for a performance in exchange for “the experience, the travel, and a meal.”

In many moments, the material demands of our lives as artists make themselves known through the insistence of our bodies, our shared circumstances, our particular fates, and the greater field of politics. I have so many anecdotes that I could add up and share.

I could do a series of shows . . . or not.

What has been missing for me is a theme, a method to articulate the way these demands present themselves as a general insistence. What has been missing for me is a framework for own responses so that my explanation to an artist is never “that’s just the way it has always been,” but “this is why it is, and this is what it means.”

Chapter One: Introduction

This dissertation asks how systems of support for independent performing artists account for their artistic processes as well as the products they create. I examine artists' material practices through the texts and contexts that structure our lives—namely, historically-informed cultural policy issues, artist support organizations, and artist support mechanisms as diverse as grants, collaborations, and spectatorship. These material practices channel the flow of capital (social, financial, cultural, and intellectual) in artists' lives so that physical, emotional, and spiritual needs are met. I believe that these texts and contexts hold a few very basic meanings that govern our work and that these basic meanings are forgotten in the habituation of practice.

This dissertation makes a distinction between "material" and "materialist" concerns. I use the term "material" to describe the forms of capital that support artists and their work. I use the term "materialist" to refer to the social, psychological, physical, and financial consciousness that attends an artist when making work and making a living supporting one's career and cultural community. "Material" refers to processes. Materialist addresses a perceptual framework derived from basic human needs.

My research takes a cultural studies approach, applying economic and social theory and the stories of independent artists, including myself, to analyze four operational modes in the field of performance.[1] Each model is derived from a specific type of material practice: networking, needs-based cultural policy, public and private support, and individual entrepreneurialism. For each mode, I examine the root word for the practice: "network," "need," "support," and "entrepreneur." For each word, the work of

[1] In *Against the Romance of Community* (2002), Miranda Joseph describes a cultural studies approach as a close reading that focuses on "the production and consumption of [. . .] text" (viiii). Similarly, my investigation examines how specific cultural practices are produced and consumed, or engaged, by artists.

one or more organizations illustrate effectively, though not exclusively, how the practices are applied: the National Performance Network ("network"), the Urban Institute and Leveraging Investments in Creativity (LINC) ("need"), the National Association of Latino Arts and Cultures ("support"), and the Creative Capital Foundation ("entrepreneur"). Many of these practices occur in a space that is referred to as "behind the scenes." For me, "behind the scenes" is too local to capture the many resources available to artists. I use the term "and everything else" to refer to artists' practices performed around production with production in mind. As an activist, an independent performing artist, and a scholar, I am committed to finding ways to illuminate artists' material concerns when (or even between) making work and making a living.

The conflicts and challenges facing performance artists in the marketplace are poorly understood by artists and non-artists alike. Frequently, misunderstandings and misgivings emerge from interwoven spaces that accommodate long-held assumptions, archaic practices, stereotypes, and even pride (Jackson et al. *Investing* 3). In the world of arts and culture, artists are talked about with great regularity and regarded variously as subjects, objects, and intermediaries in the stories of their own lives. In the United States, as in many other countries, the art world consists of artists, arts organizers, cultural policymakers, economists, social scientists, performance scholars, students, avowed spectators, and publics at-large that participate, however wittingly and variously, in the production of culture.[2] The academy, the field of performance, and the governmental and private organizations address, create, and/or support policy for the arts from the standpoints of both supply and demand (Wyszomirski, "Policy Communities" 98). Economists, once concerned primarily with the demand side of the equation,

[2] The term "art worlds" was developed by sociologist Howard Becker to characterize the socio-economic circumstances and contributions of artists in the production of culture. Although I use the term more generally here, I think it important to note that Becker identifies "art worlds" as the collaborative product of art producers and consumers (Alexander 75).

continue to borrow from the social sciences, including psychology, to look at artistic impulses for the supply-side of cultural production (Frey 20-22). Sociologists, economists, anthropologists, and performance scholars share the resources of cultural studies to examine the material means of artist production (Alexander 1-16). Students and emerging performers, much like policy workers, face a field that is rife with linguistic specializations, arcane processes, and regional differences (Wyzsomirski 100; Jackson et al. 4-5).

At the same time that these vested parties discuss artists' sustainability, artists continue to discount their labor, taking non-monetary rewards in exchange for the privilege of making art or as an investment in a future return (Abbing 37-39). Demand, however, is always uncertain (Caves 2). Frequently, artists battle or accept the characterization of their careers as necessarily "starving" and "impetuous"; or, at the other end of the spectrum, they project for themselves a highly successful career marked by a vast commercial, "superstar" appeal (Caves 73-83).[3] Economists aware of the quantitative imbalance between successful outcomes versus the difficult conditions facing most artists fear that the superstar effect, as well as other benefits like grants and subsidies, offer misguiding appeal to aspiring artists, who enter the field after irrationally assuming their own vaguely defined success. Hans Abbing has called this phenomenon the "signaling effect" (139). From my own perspective, the signaling effect is based on a vague notion of what success entails. I argue that the same gap that holds aspirations, presumptions, misguidance, and hard-earned wisdoms also holds a wealth of information about the material prospects for artists' lives.

[3] The term "superstar" is an economic concept, which describes how artists who reach a certain level of acclaim must follow a growth model and appeal to greater and greater audiences in order to maintain their position (Caves 73-83). I examine the implications of the superstar model in my chapter on networks.

This dissertation identifies and examines the lives of independent performing artists in the United States today. I define independent performing artists as those who, like me, work as self-employed businesspeople, independent of unions and incorporated 501(c) (3) not-for-profit status.[4] Like many other artists, we share a number of employment patterns: many of us work more than one job to support our art-making; frequently, we change our jobs or find new projects for income; and we tend to make less than people with "comparable education and skill sets" (Jackson et al *Investing* 30-34).

The performers who speak and who are addressed directly in this dissertation are artists working primarily outside of a theatrical mainstream. Many of us include solo performance as part of our repertoire, but take a variety of performance opportunities. Many of us live outside of New York. Our access to commercial spaces and opportunities is limited by the form our work takes, our geographical location, our experience, and our identity. Many of us are women, people of color, and queer. Some of us are mid-career performers; some are entry-level. Our colleagues include dancers and choreographers, writer-performers, visual artist-performers, musicians, community-based performers, playwrights, and actors. What draws us together into a group are the opportunities and practices that we share, including performance residencies, grants and fellowships, guest artist teaching work, and self-employment contributions to social security and retirement. In economic terms, we function in a creative industry; unlike workers allied in firms, performing artists work independently in the competitive market, generally on a contract-to-contract basis (Caves 1-2).

Investing in Creativity, the 2002 study about artists which I examine in my chapter on need, defines us "as adults who have received training in an artistic discipline/tradition, define [ourselves] professionally as artists, and attempt to derive

[4] As I explain in chapter 3, "Invoking Need," 501 (c) (3) designates the tax code for tax-exempt organizations under which most artist-based non-profit organizations file.

income from work in which [we] use [our] expert artistic vocational skills" (Jackson et al. 1). My examination moves beyond skill, training, income, and discipline. I interrogate place, tradition, spirit, independence, competition, collaboration, and communication among other qualities and methods of practice. I study artists who are invested in local, national, international communities, artists who respond to a crumbling cultural infrastructure in the United States by giving back time and money, artists who struggle to make ends meet, and artists who do not. The independent artists in this study model a variety of experiences familiar to their colleagues. I interrogate how we approach our work, what assumptions inform our practices, what information we have yet to share, and what radical approaches can offer. In my experience—even among the artists talking in this dissertation—few independent performing artists speak comfortably about income per show, per gig, or per year. And yet the story of how we came to those amounts is valuable information to be shared, for it speaks not only of individual accomplishment, but the resources of the cultural organizations in which we work.

At my home performance space, Jump-Start, the novelist Sandra Cisneros frequently brings first-time theater-goers to shows. For this act, she calls herself a "cultural coyote." The term is political. In the borderlands of South Texas, a "coyote" is commonly understood as someone who ferries individuals or groups of immigrants across the U.S.-Mexico border. Cisneros reconstitutes the coyote act between the borders of cultural production and reception. Through their material practices, artists often mentor fellow artists or cultivate spectators for their work. Like coyotes, this work is discrete, involving a series of smaller relations. Like coyotes, artists work in dialectical relation to a historically informed border, that dividing the cultural sector from the greater public. Within the cultural sector, there are other borders, among disciplines, nonprofit and for-profit approaches, and generations, to name a few. Like coyotes and immigrants,

independent artists face a nation that is ambivalent about the support for their work. Through their practices artists remain aware of resources and opportunities. In this dissertation, I theorize and present a means to make visible a community of cultural coyotes among independent artists to interact with historically informed cultural conditions, in effect contesting the borders of language and perception.

I argue throughout this document that artists work in a discursive framework that influences their interactions. In many ways, my approach resonates with Stanley Fish's work on interpretive communities: "Interpretive communities are made up of both producers and consumers of particular kinds of knowledge, of texts, often operating within a particular institutional context [. . .] within particular divisions of cultural labor [. . .] or within particular places" (qtd. in Harvey 47). In general, artists are acknowledged as creative thinkers. In their material practices they must negotiate structured approaches with personal needs and individual abilities. Through this dissertation, I intend to make apparent the effects of some of these structures.

The artists that I have interviewed for this dissertation—indeed, the artists whose works inspire me to write about practice—generally take on the role that I call the "artist-producer," when making a new production or touring a show. As artist-producers, we perform fundraising, production coordination, and staffing duties in addition to making art. We hire artistic associates whom we pay from our proceeds. Some of us fill out requisite tax forms for these associates, like directors, whose professional fees may cost us more than $600 per year and thus require reporting. Many of us run our own technical rehearsals on the road, effectively serving as our own stage managers. While there may be an executive producer who books us or commissions a new work, we take responsibility for the final product.

New York Times critic Margo Jefferson sums up this approach as the "*les art c'est moi* syndrome" (emphasis in original). Jefferson says that the syndrome often leads to a failing in the work. She refers to George Balanchine and Martha Graham as "multi-talented artists" who benefited from well-known collaborators, such as sculptor Isamu Noguchi, and composers Aaron Copeland and Igor Stravinsky. Jefferson adds that solo performers Deb Margolin and newcomer Nijala Sun could benefit from directors who would bring "nuance" to their works. Jefferson does not interrogate access to the material conditions that may face Margolin, a woman, and Sun, a woman and person of color ("Words to the Wise"). Cultural historian John Kriedler depicts the 1960s—the years when Balanchine and Graham were productive—as a period when the cost of living was low and the economy robust ("Leverage" 160). Kriedler's work makes me wonder how Margolin's and Sun's approaches might be different in a different time. Likewise, his work inspires me to consider the artist-producer role historically. I examine each artist's reason for hyphenated practice and each artist's availability to alternatives.

All of the artists cited in this dissertation were located through my own practice as an artist-producer. Some artists are presented through their appearances on panels, at meetings, or in texts. Some of the artists I interviewed. I did not offer the colleagues that I interviewed a set group of questions. Rather, I explained the project and asked them to engage me in one or more conversations about how they supported their work. To call our conversations ethnographies is to commit myself to even more texts than are already being examined. In truth, the only ethnography is my own. The aritsts' conversations and responses are filtered through my perception and experience.

In my research, I challenged myself to locate artists through different material practices. At various times, I am a participant, a colleague, a spectator, a collaborator, and a scholar. I met with artists while they were making productions, contemplating new

works, or considering making life changes. I participated in making performances, writing grants, reading grants, and attending meetings and conferences. All in all, I found artists ready to theorize their material work and to articulate their practices. I found the various texts I read, the voices I heard, and the practices I witnessed thought-provoking and applicable to my own practices as an artist.

I have worked as an independent artist for 20 years, and I have spent much of that time trying to understand the material conditions facing me and my colleagues. Immediately after receiving my undergraduate degree in Liberal Arts from the University of Texas at Austin (1986), I worked as an independent professional ballet and modern dancer. While pursuing a Master of Arts in English and Communications from St. Mary's University in San Antonio (1991), I began working as an independent writer-producer for a documentary series, *Heritage*, which was broadcast on PBS-affiliate stations. I later parlayed those skills, both narrative and organizational, into staged performances.

Performance artist Linda Montano likens the performer's life to a lifelong calling:

> It has always been my personal belief that the themes artists employ are born in childhood and that an artist's work explores, transforms, perpetuates, or makes the information from that time understandable and manageable via symbolic acts—art. (xi)

Montano's definition implies that artists are born. My own performances began as a result of identity and experience—as a result of what I could not have known. Nevertheless, I share Montano's belief that the sum total of my experiences contributed to my work on the stage.

I began my performance work in largely queer performance spaces during the early 1990s, when AIDS protests and queer performance were peaking in both popularity and renown. At the time, the identity politics that had emerged in the 1970s and 1980s were still avidly pursued.[5] Like many other queer artists of my age, my earliest works were coming-out stories. In a trilogy of solo shows—*Talk of the Town* (1992), *The Bible Belt and Other Accessories* (1993), and *Love in the Time of College* (1994)—I reimagined my own rural Texas and Mississippi upbringing as one not marked by suffering and alienation (as I remembered it) but coalition-building and celebration (as I very much wanted it).

The serialized works created a momentum that kept me returning to waiting and growing audiences at theaters across the nation for the remainder of the decade. While still touring with my first three shows, I began to create other works that examined other aspects of my identity and responded to the communities in which I operated: *Quinceañera* (1997), which I co-created with Alberto Antonio Araiza, Michael Marinez, and Danny Bolero Zaldivar, provided a Chicano celebration of survival for the first 15 years of the AIDS pandemic; *Memory's Caretaker* (1999), a solo show, examined the silences that haunted my family's cultural assimilation. In addition, I began to create large-scale community-based works, establishing a multi-disciplinary dance company, B'Alamo, at my home theater—Jump-Start Performance Co. in San Antonio. I created new works in collaboration with students during long-term residencies, most notably as a twice-appointed Tennessee Williams Fellow at the University of the South. I wrote and adapted plays for other performers and writers, including the performer Kitty Williams and the poet Naomi Shihab-Nye. I taught frequently, both independently and in

[5] David Román writes compellingly of this period in *Acts of Intervention* (1998). In *States of Injury: Power and Freedom in Late Modernity* (1995), Wendy Brown writes of identity politics as politics sustained by coalitions of individuals who seek recognition and redress for their hurt.

collaboration. I saw my work as a way to participate in the progressive politics of my nation.

The apparent fecundity of my initial years as a creating artist—made possible through the devotion of queer-friendly audiences—belied the greater crisis that attended the nation's cultural community of that era, especially among queer performers. By 1989, the so-called "culture wars" erupted on the national stage when Congress protested the National Endowment for the Arts' funding of various projects which were construed as subversive to conservative values.[6] The first to have funds cut were independent visual artists Andres Serrano and Robert Mapplethorpe. A little over a year later, four performance artists—John Fleck, Karen Finley, Holly Hughes, and Tim Miller—were cut as well (Brenson 92-93).

In 1992, at Tim Miller's encouragement and with his letter of recommendation, I applied for my first NEA fellowship. I did not receive it, and I missed the next deadline two years later. In 1995, Congress cut the Endowment budget from $162.3 million to $99.5 million (Brenson 89-90). In turn, the NEA cut all of its programs supporting individual artists, except for "Literature Fellowships, National Heritage Fellowships in the Folk and Traditional Arts, and American Jazz Master Fellowships" (Jackson et al. 15).[7] Since that time, most independent artists have had to rely on intermediary funding organizations to receive grant support from the government as well as many private foundations (Jackson et al. 11). These organizations include the National Performance Network, LINC, NALAC, and Creative Capital, which I examine in the following chapters.

---

[6] The term "culture wars" is a contested term, raising questions about the difference between a war and an attack. Benjamin Barber attributes the term to fundamentalist politician Pat Buchanan, who ran his political campaign as a war on culture, or culture war (26).

[7] These included 23 individual fellowship and grant categories, 8 new commission or project categories to individuals working through organizational intermediaries, 10 artist residency fellowships, and 19 subgrant programs that reached individuals through other organizations (Ziegler 152).

In the *Queen of America Goes to Washington City*, Lauren Berlant writes that the 1980s wrought a narrow "definitional field of citizenship," largely through the discourses of the Reagan presidency (31). Often through Reagan's own citations, protean images of patriotism portrayed in cold war era movies asserted themselves on the American people, who now tried to locate the enemy among each other (7-8). At the same time, an emergent, though powerful, nationwide right-wing Christian movement emerged and took hold of a vast support base, further narrowing the definition of citizenship. The racial, sexual, and gendered subalterns who had the temerity to assert themselves on the stage, in film, in galleries, and in museums were considered a threat to the nation (Brenson 92-94). The conflicts that emerged rippled across the nation, affecting all levels of artist participation and support (Tepper 1-3). Berlant notes that the discourses like "pull yourself up by your bootstraps" and the "American Dream" were resuscitated and coupled with "trickle down economics," the name given to Reagan's plan to stimulate the economy by supporting the wealthy few who would presumably employ the working masses. The potent combination of what I call "the haves" and "the hope-to-have-soon" created a meritocracy based on wealth and consumption and helped roll back the social justice advances of previous eras (3-5). In this atmosphere, many artists were accused of receiving undeserved entitlements through the public sector. Most of these artists were from the alternative sector. They were poor, queer, women, and people of color whose work was not generally lucrative, even in the face of high-profile scandal (Brenson 90-94).[8]

The political scientist and writer Benjamin Barber sees the endgame of trickle-down economics and Reagan-era rhetoric in what he calls the "end or work" or "enforced

[8] As I point out in my chapter on networks, the term "lucrative" may be relative to identity and/or to medium. Visual works of art are quick to become commodities, especially in light of scandal. Thus, the photographer Robert Mapplethorpe saw his work grow in popularity and acclaim during the so-called "culture wars" (Brenson 92-94).

leisure." Enforced leisure results from corporate downsizing and the reduction of social services in democracies where wage labor has been the foundation of the value system. Like Berlant, Barber recognizes that society now prizes individuals who are employed and prosperous and disdains those who are not. Prosperity equals worth at a time when "society is becoming far better at producing goods than producing jobs (11)."

The coupling of work and "virtue" is longstanding in modern Western tradition. Protestants connected redemption to "labor on earth." British philosopher John Locke saw labor of nature as a testimony to man's commitment to the earthly existence. Marx used Locke's "labor theory of value" to rationalize revolution, since human beings deserved full and fair shares of the products of their labors (Barber 130). However, the value put on prosperous work signals advanced capitalism. Barber sees the end of work as a significant contributor, along with the rollback of civil rights, to "the growing incivility in our public discourses" (11).

Barber is a proponent of neoprogressivism, a movement that seeks to preserve the prerequisites of citizenship by encouraging political participation and activism. In *A Place for Us* (1998), Barber presents and unpacks a conceptual framework for a strong democratic civil society that includes a valuable role for artists. The framework consists of three equal sectors: the state, the market, and a third sector that "mediates between our specific individuality as economic producers and consumers and our abstract collectivity as members of a sovereign people" (4). Political theorist Michael Walzer calls the third sector "the space of uncoerced human association" (qtd. in Barber 4). In a democratic civil society, the members of this third space are recognized by their civic contributions (5).

In Barber's civil society, artists occupy the civic space: "the arts are civil society's driving engine, the key to its creativity, its diversity, its imagination, and hence its

spontaneity and liberty" (112). Artists today have been largely left to the market, where they are subject to its harsh whims. Barber points out that this condition serves neither the artists nor society: "a government that supports the arts is not engaging in philanthropic activity but assuring the conditions of its own flourishing" (109). Barber does not argue for a free lunch. He believes that artists must work, and as citizens they have a particular responsibility: "in contributing to and nourishing an arts-supportive civil society, they serve both democracy and themselves, both their fellow citizens and their art" (110).

Artists share the civic sector with volunteers and unpaid laborers, including volunteers to public service, mothers, and other public and private caretakers (128, 133). In the "end of work" era, these various caretakers are maligned for not being wage earners (136). Barber finds incivility in the public outcry against Clinton's Learn and Serve Program at the Corporation for National Service (Americorps) which gave students education vouchers for time spent volunteering in communities of need (128). He finds incivility in the hue and cry against mothers' requiring welfare assistance (132). Barber says that the solution is for society to "find new ways to distribute non-labor based productivity [i.e. 'wage earners'] to the general population, whether or not they work for their living" (135).

I appreciate the value that Barber ascribes to artists. I find his ascription of artist value to be consonant with other arguments in the arts, such as Joli Jenson's notion of an "expressive logic," which I examine in my chapter on need. I even feel comfortable being aligned with the maligned welfare mothers and unpaid volunteers in the "end of work" era. But I also find Barber's work to be immaterial and aphoristic at times. His call that we pull together and recognize alternative value reads like a command that everyone stop and take a breath, even as capitalism continues its drive forward. In

instances like this, I am inspired by Marx's emphasis in *The German Ideology* on studying real human interactions rather than those informed by an idea of an essential human being. In this dissertation, I challenge myself and other artists to recognize our labors, to articulate our processes, and to consider the materiality of our work—what it costs and what it earns—when engaging in systems of support. I encourage artists to couple their materialist approach with hope. I believe that through these very concrete steps that are motivated and sustained by feelings we can begin to address change.

Barber's recognition that artists navigate public, or civic concerns, and private concerns resonates with my experience. In the mid-1990s, during this period of national crisis, I committed myself to my field. I co-founded and served as Board Chair for the San Antonio Dance Umbrella, a dance service organization. I served on boards of directors for Jump-Start Performance Co., the National Performance Network (NPN), and the Blue Star Contemporary Arts Center. I worked a panelist for city, state, federal, and private arts funding entities, including the National Endowment for the Arts, Arts International, the Association of Arts Presenters, the Texas Commission on the Arts, the Ohio Arts Council, and the San Antonio Department of Arts and Cultural Affairs. I made donations to all of the organizations where I served and where I performed. I participated in roundtables about the organization and/or re-organization of programs at Creative Capital, the Association of Performing Arts Presenters (APAP), and the National Performance Network. In the face of local funding crises, I spoke regularly and repeatedly at city council or at local cultural arts board meetings.

This type of civic work made sense to me. I was born to Catholic parents whose missionary zeal extended to religious and cultural activities alike. My brothers and I were schooled in the value of "spiritual and corporal works of mercy," the term given to charitable obligations of spirit and flesh. My parents helped build two churches—one in

the old town of Dillon, Colorado, and another in Glen Rose, Texas, where I spent many formative years. We practiced "cultural works of mercy" as well. Unlike their corporal and spiritual counterparts, these works brought earthly returns as well as costs. In Glen Rose, my mother, brother Stephen, and I helped found a community theater. We hired directors from Fort Worth and co-produced musicals and plays. One year after losing the director for our production of *A Christmas Carol,* Stephen and I scrapped Dickens's script and created an original musical for the loosely assembled company of fifteen. I wrote the book to *Santa's Workshop*, and Stephen wrote the music and lyrics (which come back to haunt me, even as I write). Stephen directed, and I performed a supporting, but terribly important, role as a wayward elf. Some twenty years later, while I was working frenetically in my performance field, my mother was midway into a 20 year stint as the Director of the Navarro Council of the Arts in Corsicana, TX, a town of 20,000 near Dallas. She produced a constant stream of arts events in five neighboring communities. My visits home were often spent writing articles for my mother's monthly newsletter in the office where Mom worked seven days a week, and where my Dad, now retired, was put to work as the volunteer in charge of budgets and filing. My mother's visits to Central and South Texas were generally coordinated with her grant panels, arts conferences, and award events. She was frequently honored. At one state event, my mother was introduced as the "Mother Teresa of the Arts" in Texas. That meant a lot to her. I feared that the title set her up for even more devotion.

After several years of constant arts activity, I began to dwell on the material differences between me and many of my colleagues who served in these governing capacities on boards and panels. Many of them were salaried workers whose income was not threatened when they had to turn down work to donate time to a fundraiser or event. Many were arts administrators who, like my mother, grew exhausted and ill as they

capably handled everything so that the Board did not have to work very hard. I grew weary of the nonprofit model and the artist's place in the pecking order. Also, I contracted ulcerative colitis, a disease based on an auto-immune disorder in which the body attacks itself. In a few short years, when I did not have health insurance, I accrued over $20,000 in medical bills which I finally repaid in 2003.

At the insistence of my health, I began to curtail the donated time that conflicted with my income and to prioritize financial, emotional, and spiritual stability—as best I could understand them. I still served, but I measured my participation. My entrance into what has become the Performance as Public Practice Program (PPP) at the University of Texas at Austin resulted from my growing need to understand the theories and practices that govern the material transactions for independent artists like myself. On the material side, it coincided with my aspiration for a more permanent position (with benefits) at the colleges and universities where I regularly appeared as an artist. Interestingly, my health problems began to disappear once I obtained health insurance. I do not discount the role of stress.

The greater benefit of the PPP program is that it has given me an opportunity to bridge the divide between artist and scholar – indeed, to see how the two are intricately linked. Fashioned out of the Theater History, Criticism, Theory, and Text Program, the Performance as a Public Practice Program encourages its scholars to ground their theory-based research in public practice and to understand performance as an active extension of scholarship. The year before I entered the PPP Program, I completed a residency at the University of the South during which I collaborated with 25 students for the writing and producing of a play about the campus's drinking history and habits. Following the event, I wanted to write about the experience for a scholarly journal, but I felt I did not have the skill set to do so. My hesitation, I see now, is similar to that of many artists who stand

before an academic community and begin their introductions with the disclaimer, "I am not an academic." I would argue that such a comment opens a gap where one need not exist. Scholars read the texts of artists as scholarship; artists use research when making art. The PPP program has given me the tools and the encouragement to read across literatures when examining all aspects of my work. It has also taught me that the goals of both are complementary to each other.

My examination into the lives of artists, including my own, begins with the assertion that I occupy multiple subject positions across hyphenated affinities, and that the resulting identity can be used to progressive ends rather than exclusionary ones. Performance scholar Jill Dolan identifies herself as an "artist-citizen-scholar," someone who uses equally her multiple identity locations to participate fully in performance and civic life. My graduate studies in the Performance as Public Practice Program have brought me to the point of sharing in that identity location. I see the terms as interchangeable rather than hierarchically cast. I may at any point use one term first, but I am always all three. The confluence of terms offers a consciousness that puts me "beside, rather than above" a greater number of people who are affected by the existence and well-being of arts and culture in their lives. At the same time, it requires a rigor of reflexivity across subject positions (Bonin-Rodriguez, Dolan, Pryor, "Colleague Criticism").

In this dissertation, I use my position as "artist-citizen scholar" to inform my status as a "participant-observer" among colleagues. My critical framework is also influenced by a type of critical inquiry called "colleague criticism," which has been developed by Jaclyn Pryor, Jill Dolan, and myself through two conference presentations as well as her blog, "The Feminist Spectator." "Colleague criticism" is a type of performance writing in which the author foregrounds her or his personal and/or

professional relationship with the artist about whom s/he is writing and, in so doing, restructures the formerly hierarchical relationship between artist and critic and replaces it with a queer model of criticism based on notions of love, support, and investment. This work is indebted to Dolan's ongoing study of performance and utopia. Pryor notes that "colleague criticism addresses the politics of reception as a politics of hope" (Pryor and Bonin-Rodriguez, "Performing"; Dolan, "Introduction"; Dolan "The Feminist Spectator").

I have been inspired by Dolan's work in another way. In her recent book, *Utopia and Performance*, Dolan attempts to "reanimate humanism" through the recognition of audience reception practices, which have long been dominated by the tools of poststructuralism. Poststructuralists, the literary counterparts to postmodernists, read texts according to their intersections with other texts (Harvey 28).[9] Dolan succinctly states that poststructuralism has offered both challenges and benefits to humanism.

> [P]oststructuralism [has] dismantled so-called master-narratives and canonical texts and belief systems and usually allowed commentators to deconstruct the inculcations of conservative ideas about gender, sexuality, race, ethnicity, and other identity markers, as well as to instill doubt as a generative mode of thinking. (*Utopia* 21)

As Dolan notes, the tools of deconstruction have also pulled the veil from the effects of late capitalism, effectively destabilizing the notion of a cogent society and leaving cynicism where humanism and a faith in democracy once prevailed (Ibid). Dolan finds faith in the theater – in the "momentary feeling of affinity, in which spectators experience

[9] David Harvey cites Ferdinand de Saussere's founding of poststructuralism in 1911 (28). In addition, he notes that postructuralism found its medium and methodology through the mechanism of deconstructionism, which was "initiated by Derrida's reading of Martin Heidegger in the late 1960s" (49).

themselves as part of a congenial public constituted by the performer's address" (14). By turning my head from the spectators to the stage, I find faith among the performers who continue to make work despite the mysteries and struggles surrounding the field.

Methodologically, this dissertation owes much to Raymond Williams's concept of "keywords." "Keywords" are a set of words that describe and define human activity, as well as the intellectual conceits supporting the descriptions (*Keywords* 15). Keywords represent William's belief that "language" is "a constitutive element of material social practice," bearing history in past, present, and future forms. For Williams, a dictionary is a useful tool, but riven with "the ideology of its editors" (18). In *Keywords*, Williams invokes "historical semantics" to reveal how language can be both reflexive and generative in the social sphere:

> We find a history and complexity of meanings; conscious changes, or consciously different uses; innovation, obsolescence, specialization, extension, overlap, transfer; or changes which are masked by a nominal continuity so that words which seem to have been there for centuries, with continuous general meanings, have come in fact to express radically different or radically variable, yet sometimes hardly noticed, meanings and implications of meaning. (17)

Historical semantics offer up a word's past uses as well as its "present meanings, implications, and relationships" (23). With their still-shifting meanings laid bare, keywords provide "not resolutions, but perhaps, at times, an extra edge of consciousness" (24).

Williams first introduced the concept of keywords as a rubric for the examination of history in *Culture and Society: 1890 to 1950*:

> Five words are the key points from which this map can be drawn. They are *industry*, *democracy*, *class*, *art* and *culture*. The importance of these words, in our modern structure of meanings, is obvious. The changes in their use, at this critical period, bear witness to a general change in our characteristic ways of thinking about our common life: about our social, political and economic institutions; about the purposes which these institutions are designed to embody; and about the relations to these institutions and purposes of our activities in learning, education and arts (xiii, emphasis in original).

Williams argues that the materialist history of the Industrial Revolution is embedded and encapsulated by the concurrent semantic evolutions of just five words. Placed together, they reveal a verbal structure for characterizing human innovation and capitalist organization of economic labor and classes (*Keywords* 13-15). Published in 1958, *Culture and Society* predates *Marxism and Literature* by nineteen years.[10]

Raymond Williams's definition of culture holds a central place in his life's work. Originally used to denote the "cultivation" of crops, and, by metaphorical extension, of human minds, the term culture took on greater social importance in the mid-eighteenth century (*Culture and Society* xvi; *Keywords* 87; *Marxism and Literature* 13). Within a short period, new meanings were added to define the word: culture came to refer to the state of the mind and the state of society, as well as "the general body of the arts"

[10] In *Marxism and Literature*, Williams lays down the methodological and theoretical foundations for his later elaborations on Marxist materialism, which emerged from his greater reading into Georg Lukacs, Lucien Goldmann, Jean-Paul Sartre, and the writers of the Frankfurt school, including Walter Benjamin, Louis Althusser, and Antonio Gramsci (*Marxism and Literature* Introduction 3-4). As in the earlier work, Williams offers four words – "culture," "language," "literature," and "ideology" – as an entry point into his examination into the material effects of language in *Marxism and Literature* (Introduction 5)

(*Culture and Society* xvi; *Keywords* 88-89; *Marxism and Literature* 14-15). Williams notes that for a time, especially during the latter part of the eighteenth century, culture was used synonymously with "civilization" to describe social developments within capitalism; however, during the Romantic movement, Jean-Jacques Rousseau led a movement to separate the word from the mundane of "external" associations, and apply it to the "inner" and "spiritual" aspects of artists' drives and lives. Culture came under the provenance of "religion, art, the family and personal life" (*Marxism and Literature* 14). As the industrial age progressed and the secularizing forces of industrialization met humanist thought, culture and civilization merged again under the rubric of higher order thought and organization. The word denoted a type of civilization; its adjectival form indicated the process of unique, "cultured" development. Culture marked civilization at its most deliberately drawn, and as such, it provided the appropriate medium for the conscious examination of other forms of human interaction and organization: "materialism, commercialism, democracy, [and] socialism" (*Marxism and Literature* 15).[11]

For Williams, culture represents the *system* through which consciousness and production are materially enacted and historically sustained (*Marxism and Literature* 79-80). The material aspects of each artist's cultural productions hold a complex, expressive relationship to culture in general. This relationship is informed by the discourses that sustain the field. Words trouble, incite, and coalesce into action. Words can support critique and re-imagining just as easily as they can defend and maintain old practices. By

[11] Williams's development of keywords, and especially his writings on culture, facilitate his progression from a stricter to a more nuanced interpretation of Marx's writings – what he calls the transition from "Marx to Marxism" (*Marxism and Literature* 75). This progression supported his expansive theoretical writings on Marx's notion of materialism and informs my own understanding of the underlying material conditions encountered by independent artists. Raymond Williams critiques Marx's early writings for making too great a distinction between materialist consciousness and production rather than acknowledging the two as integrated processes (*Marxism and Literature* 78; Roseberry 29).

suggesting that the processes of meaning-making are ongoing, connected, and expanding, keywords offer discourse as a site of an active praxis as well as the disciplinary tools to examine arts-based practices. Independent artists face a field that has been cross-cultivated with crops of programs from public and private agencies. I argue that the sum of artists' programs—grants, fellowships, residencies, to name a few—amount to a structurally-informed approach that artists frequently regard as obligatory steps.[12] In this dissertation, I want to make evident the history of these approaches and offer up radical considerations.

My research is largely informed by the threads of materialist scholarship that address the affective relationships of individuals working together towards a common cause. Consequently, Williams's concept of "structures of feeling" contributes substantially to the theoretical underpinnings of this dissertation. "Structures of feeling" describes social experiences "actively lived and felt" among a specific "set of relations" (*Marxism and Literature* 132).[13] Like keywords, structures of feeling are informed by past and present circumstances, but because they are "still *in process*" and not articulated, they prefigure semantics (133-34, emphasis in original).

Marxist scholar Richard Flores depicts structures of feeling as a driving force behind the labor of performance. In *Los Pastores*, his book about the annual Mexican Shepherd plays in San Antonio, Flores describes performance as emerging from the performers' shared desire to counter a sense of cultural alienation through the annual performance of a traditional Mexican play.[14] Likewise, my own performance career

---

[12] Lauren Berlant makes a similar argument about the radical social theorists whose adherence to identity politics has "disconnected [them] from more important and public questions of equity, justice, and violence in political life in general. [T]hey have been misdirected by *a false distinction between the merely personal and the profoundly structural*" (9, emphasis mine).

[13] For this quotation, I am indebted to Flores, who describes Williams's structures of feeling as "social forces that are 'actively lived and felt and marked by a particular 'set' of 'relations'" (*Los Pastores* 148).

[14] To situate the creation of the Shepherd plays, Flores grounds his argument in a dialectical relationship between "free activity" (or "praxis") and estrangement (or "alienation"). Flores notes that Marx vacillates

emerged from a sense of cultural alienation from my various social locations, as well as my commitment to community. Although *Los Pastores* analyzes the work of non-professional performers, I find its focus on the political origins of performance and the political aspects of production especially relevant to my research and art.

Although I use the term sparingly, I'm also influenced by William's contributions to Antonio Gramsci's notion of hegemony. Gramsci defined hegemony as "manufactured consent" (Mouffe, "Hegemony and Ideology" 178-179). Finding Gramsci's terms too static, Williams recast hegemony as "the whole lived social process [. . .] practically organized by specific dominant meanings and values" (*Marxism and Literature* 109). Like structures of feeling, hegemony must be "renewed, recreated, defended and modified" to maintain its dominance (112). Whereas Gramsci's definition focused on its creation and structure, Williams's definition focuses on it as a lived process in constant negotiation (114). Flores reminds us that structures of feeling play more than a comparative role inhegemony; they are its constitutive medium: "[h]egemony is the process of imposition, coercion, consent, negotiation, and acquiescence in the maintenance of and resistance to particular social formations" (163). Flores's definition provides a space for arguing how material structures emerge from history and become renewed daily.

Marxist scholar Chantal Mouffe argues that hegemonies are always subject to reconfiguration. Her work gives me a sense of how change can emerge from the forces of alliance-building and resistance to systems of coercion. At the same time, Mouffe reminds me that such alliances are subject to reiterating the exclusions experienced and

---

between dual characterizations of labor as either praxis or alienation in his *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. For Flores, the "fluid boundaries" between praxis and alienation provide a reciprocal "tension" that feeds structures of feeling that result in the ongoing performance tradition (*Los Pastores* 149).

that progressive politics are subject to constant recognition and negotiation ("Democratic Citizenship" 234-235).[15]

As an artist who continues to work actively across the cultural sector, I continue to find individuals who, like me, are multiply vested. I use the term "cultural sector" to refer to the presenters, arts organizers, funders, scholars, and spectators who participate in and support the well-being of art and artists in myriad ways. Generally from backstage, the show becomes a site of cooperation and hope. Backstage contains the contributions of all those who are on the other sides of the stage, not only in the stage "house," but the administrative offices, the newspaper beats, the centers of policy and support, and the coffee shops and bars where word-of-mouth hopefully does its job. By examining the practices in place through various systems of support, I seek to address both accomplishments and better practices.

The texts and practices examined in this dissertation are drawn from the academy, as well as government and private sources. I gather all of these under the rubric of the "literatures of cultural policy."[16] The designation does not refer to their site of origin, but their shared site of application.[17] I define the literature of cultural policy as a space of textual praxis for the examination and support of the production of culture.

The last four decades have witnessed a cross-fertilization of various academic and non-academic disciplines concerned with the production of culture in the United States,

---

[15] "To construct a 'we' it must be distinguished from the 'them' and that means establishing a frontier, defining an enemy. Therefore, while politics aims at constructing a political community and creating a unity, a fully inclusive political community and a final unity can never be realized since there will be a 'constitutive outside,' an exterior to the community that makes its existence possible. Antagonistic forces will never disappear and politics is characterized by conflict and division. Forms of agreement can be reached but they are always partial and provisional since consensus is by necessity based on acts of exclusion" ("Democratic Citizenship" 234-235).

[16] I am indebted to critic and cultural policy theorist Ann Daly, who helped me theorize this rubric and whose work informs my chapter on need.

[17] Cultural policy studies denotes the discipline dedicated to the collection, creation, and study of the variously drawn literatures of cultural policy. See Rothfield (1999) and DiMaggio ("Introduction" 1983).

as well as Europe (Kriedler, "Leverage" 147-167). The field of cultural economics has emerged to offer another disciplinary approach (Frey 3). The liberal state support of arts and culture once enjoyed by many European countries and once more active in the United States – though certainly never to the level of our European neighbors—has begun to subside, or has already subsided, in favor of cultural privatization (Mulcahy 165). In the wake of these changes, the field of cultural policy has emerged as a vital resource of observation, study, and change.

The existence of cultural policy literatures in the United States has been hard fought, and yet the need for it appears in its many definitions. James Smith, the former President of the Center of Arts and Culture, defines it according to what it concerns:

> Cultural policy [. . .] concerns governmental and philanthropic financing for arts and culture, but it also encompasses a range of issues such as freedom of expression, international cultural and artistic exchanges, intellectual property questions, and the effect of corporate consolidation on the nation's artistic life. (Preface ix)

Others, like independent arts consultant and policy analyst Caron Atlas, describe it according to where it appears:

> Cultural policy is connected to all the major issues of our society: economic stratification, race relations, globalization, technology, education and community development. It happens at places ranging from a family's dinner table to the board rooms of foundations, corporations and public agencies. ("Cultural Policy")

Still others, like Smith's colleague Gigi Bradford, former executive director of the Center for Arts and Culture, define it according to how it functions: "cultural policy is not a set of rules or recommendations per se, but an approach toward complex and mutable relationships, a way to think about issues, a set of tools for a rapidly changing future" ("Defining Culture" 12).

All three definitions recognize cultural policy as a discursive nexus for the many materialist approaches to the production of culture. As Atlas points out, the nation has long functioned without an explicit cultural policy. Its existence today is a necessary response to the growth in magnitude and complexity of the fields of cultural production over the century ("Cultural Policy"). Cultural policy can work as a descriptor of function or location; it is expressed through literatures that address both theory and practice, with a general aim of praxis. Because it draws from so many sources – individual, organizational, even bureaucratic – and because it affects so many aspects of the field, I feel it is the best rubric for gathering materials.

Economics and the social sciences both offer provocative means for looking at the production of culture. Once divided between issues of supply (economics) and demand (social sciences, namely sociology), both fields have begun to make use of each other's insights in recent years largely due to the growth of cultural economics, which takes both aspects into consideration (Frey and Pommerehne 12). Two connected schools of thought help explain the economy of the arts in cultural economics. Neoclassical economists use a clear behavioral model presuming common sense decisions as the basis for most decisions related to supply and demand (Frey 6). As Randy Martin succinctly states it, neo-classical economists presume a "universe of free-willed individuals whose choices are based on maximizing reason and reward" (Review 192).[18]

[18] Neoclassical economists writing in the arts include Hans Abbing, Ruth Towse, Richard Caves, William Grampp, David Throsby, James Heilbrun, and Bruno Frey.

Rational choice theory emerged from neoclassical economics but explicitly addresses the paradoxes at work in cultural economics.[19] Economists who follow rational choice theory take sociological aspects into account, including notions of social and cultural capital, impact, and value to name a few (Towse, "Introduction" 1-15). Rational choice theorists make their examinations from two premises: 1) individuals make choices after measuring "monetary and non-monetary benefits and costs"; and 2) all "institutions are deficient in one way or another," which they call "the comparable institutional view" (Frey 5-11). By combining these two standpoints, the rational choice theorist "distinguishes between preferences, i.e. what people desire and constraints imposed by social institutions, income, prices and amount of time available" (Frey 1). These distinctions are not made in a linear, cause-effect manner, but against a framework that may include "psychological aspects, such as behavioral anomalies [. . .] which suggest that human beings deviate systematically from what is predicted by [neoclassical] rational choice analysis [. . .] under identifiable conditions" (7). Most helpful in my study are Frey's insights into artists' motivations with respect to income and creativity, for which he creates a framework that includes intrinsic and extrinsic factors often functioning simultaneously and in conflict (140-146).[20]

In general, sociologists look at "the connections among individuals, the stabilized patterns emerging from social interaction and meaning that is shared across individuals" (Alexander 7). Since the publication of Howard Becker's *Art Worlds* in 1983, the field of sociology regards artists as "talented people working professionally" in vested groups, or

[19] Frey uses the term almost ironically in response to "rational choice analysis, a basic tenet of neoclassical economics, which presumes rational-thinking individuals." Frey's rational choice framework appear to challenge the premise of the neoclassical view (1-6). Frey has his detractors, including economist Simon Blount, who argues that Frey's work offers new insights into neoclassical economics, but does not rewrite it altogether (52-55).

[20] Along with Bruno Frey, Margit Osterloh, Werner Pommerhene, James Heilbrun, Charles Gray, John O'Hagan, and David Throsby espouse rational choice theory.

worlds, as opposed to "isolated geniuses" (qtd. in Alexander 79). With respect to arts and culture, sociologists examine how artists interact with each other and with the culture at large.

Perhaps the most prominent sociologist in the theory of the production of culture is Pierre Bourdieu, who examined the various ways in which social and cultural mechanisms functioned like monetary capital ("Forms of Capital"). Bourdieu's work has inspired me to consider broadly how artists' practices earn and spend all forms of capital (especially social, cultural, intellectual, and financial capital) and to consider the effects of these transactions.

CHAPTERS

To Williams, the combination of keywords represented "a kind of structure" from which he could understand the period. Similarly, I argue that the words "network," "need," "support," and "entrepreneur" represent a kind of structure that speaks to this era. The breakdown of my chapters represents such an address.

Chapter 1, "The Labor of the Net," examines how independent performing artists make work and make it available. I argue that the process of networking derives from the complex and hierarchical processes that are explained, in part, by the technological innovations of the last 25 years. At almost the same time, the National Performance Network (NPN) was created to support the presentation of performance in communities across the nation. In much of the same ways that a laptop "hides" the complexities of its computer operations, I argue that networks "hide" their intricacies and must be analyzed to be understood. The complexities of networking as they relate to production are informed by my examination of BREAD, a site-specific performance work created by

Jaclyn Pryor in 2005, as well as the artist-focused programs at the National Performance Network.

Chapter 2, "Invoking Need," borrows heavily from cultural policy literatures to illustrate the rise and the rollback of the patron-state model of artist (and arts organization) support that has existed in the United States over the last century. Through this examination I show how the concept of "need" has been used alternately to express the needs of the nation, the needs of patrons, and the needs of the artists. My historical account ends with the Urban Institute's publication of *Investing in Creativity* (2002), a document that implicitly addresses artists' needs through the rubric "system of supports." Using Benjamin Barber's notion of a civil society, I show how "need" comes from broader social formations. Ultimately, I argue that artists must understand how need informs the history of practice and how it abstracts the actual labor of their work. In this chapter two artists, Laurie Carlos and Renita Martin, offer their insights into the value of understanding "needs" in their lives and careers. Their comments respond to my reading of *Investing in Creativity*.

Chapter 3, "Establishing Support," responds to the issues of the previous two chapters. By applying an economic analysis of motivation to artists, I show how support results from a balance of internal and external forces that determine how an artist negotiates the multiplicity of supports needed for any one career. The grant program at the National Association of Latino Arts and Culture allows me to interrogate how support is currently applied in the cultural policy sector. Ultimately, I argue for an alignment of supports through the appropriation of a new term, practice. In this chapter, three emerging/mid-career independent performing artists, Amalia Ortiz, José Rubén de León, and María Ibarra, interrogate the forms that support assumes in their lives and work.

Chapter 4, "Troubling 'Entrepreneur,'" uses a politically loaded word frequently applied to artists, businesspeople, and the unemployed to examine the play of associations facing artists in the cultural sector. Rather than argue against the word, I argue that artists should use a complex understanding of it to decode the ways in which they are characterized by it and to approach the word strategically. The Creative Capital Foundation is an organization founded in the wake of the defunding of the NEA Individual Artist program that embodies, and only occasionally admits to, entrepreneurial practices. Throughout the chapter, longtime collaborators Peggy Shaw and Lois Weaver (who now bring perspectives from different sides of the Atlantic), as well as several artists who appeared at the Fresh Terrain Festival at the University of Texas in 2003, respond and react to the notion of entrepreneurship.

"Postscript" offers a sense of what I hope for in this study, which is greater social access to the ideologies that inform or determine the material practices of independent performing artists.

Chapter Two: "The Labor of the Net"

"Networks are the fundamental stuff of which new organizations are and will be made."
—Manuel Castells (*The Rise of the Network Society*, 1996).

"[New] discoveries [in network theories] have dramatically changed what we thought we knew about the complex, interconnected world around us. Unexplained by previous network theories, hubs offer convincing proof that various complex systems have a strict architecture, ruled by fundamental laws – laws that appear to apply equally to cells, computers, languages and society."
—Albert-László Barabási and Eric Bonabeau ("Scale-Free Networks," 2003).

"With help from a group of friends (and bakers at Texas French Bread), [Jaclyn] Pryor will deliver round loaves of sourdough bread to the doorsteps of 2,006 houses in Austin in the pre-dawn hours Saturday."
—Jeanne-Clare Van Ryzin (*Austin American-Statesman*, 12/29/2005).

"The National Performance Network (NPN) is a group of diverse cultural organizers, including artists, working to create meaningful partnerships and to provide leadership that enables the practice and public experience of the performing arts in the United States."
— National Performance Network ("Mission Statement," 2006).

"Technology is neither good nor bad, nor is it neutral."
—Melvin Kranzberg, ("The Information Age: Evolution or Revolution?" 1985).

Twenty-five years ago the word "networking" crossed over from communication technologies and began to describe the ways in which individuals with shared interests mix, mingle, and trade opportunities. Twenty-fives years before then, network theories emerged in the sciences. Both the mathematic and behavioral models define a network as a "unity of disunity." The postmodern nature of network alliances challenges the cultural sector to find a stable presence through collaboration.

This chapter examines the materiality of networks in performance-making. As the preeminent method of social organization in the information age, networks are the substance through which people operate. Networks are facile; they can easily be

segmented and reorganized to operate at peak efficiency. They have contributed to the rejuvenation of capitalism and the end of statism (Castells 14). To independent performing artists, networks offer access; they also hide labor, not only the labor of individuals, but the many collaborators who help make performance happen. I argue that artists need a meta-awareness of networks to mediate network potentials with network realities. I encourage artists to develop an ethos so that network practices do not lead to exploitation of others or the over-extension of the self.

Two very different case studies illustrate independent artist networks in this chapter. BREAD was a large-scale site-specific performance project conceived and produced by Jaclyn Pryor for a civic arts festival called First Night Austin 2005.[21] From project inception to creation, Pryor made use of networks in ways that both supported and challenged her and revealed her need to approach networking judiciously. The National Performance Network (NPN) is a twenty-one year-old service organization of performing arts presenters founded on a network model. Of the 59 presenters currently in the network, a number of organizations identify as "artist run"; however, in the organization's history, only one member has been an independent artist who does not have nonprofit status (Arce, Personal Interview). Through a case study focused on the organization's programming and its changing approach to artists, I show how the NPN's struggle to embed artists into all levels of its organization revealed the limits of the NPN's networking definition. Ultimately, the more general network functions encountered by Pryor in making a performance are distinguished from the bounded, corporate network represented by the NPN. Between the two examples, I offer tools for independent artists to define their own "network approaches."

[21] According to Jaclyn Pryor, BREAD, capitalized, is a signifier for bread rising (Interview).

NETWORK APPEARANCES IN BREAD

In July 2005, as I was driving through the town of Ozuna, Texas, my friend and colleague, Jaclyn Pryor, phoned me to discuss a performance piece that she was proposing for First Night Austin, a local arts and culture celebration taking place on New Year's Eve. For the entire week leading up to the New Year, she wanted to set up a kitchen in a public space and bake bread. From the window of Arthouse at the Jones Center, a cultural space on Congress Avenue, she hoped share her fresh-baked loaves with passersby. At the end of the week, after she had baked as many loaves as she could working nonstop, Jaclyn would lead a procession of spectators to Town Lake. Once there, all gathered would toss crumbs into the river and make resolutions for the coming year. As she originally conceived it, Jaclyn's proposal combined two New Year's traditions—that of the Western calendar and that of her own Jewish tradition, Rosh Hashanah.[22]

At the moment of her call, I was on my way to Santa Fe to help my partner, Hank, at the International Folk Art Market. We were bringing several members of the family of Don Alfonso Castillo de Orta from Izucar de Matamoros, Pueblo, México, to appear as featured artists at the Market. As the road behind me stretched further away from Austin, cellular and transportation technologies maintained my connections across time and space.

My availability to both Jaclyn's and Hank's projects marked me as being involved in two networks. For one, I could bring my experience as a performer, including my own

[22] Jaclyn explained to me that 2005 marked a unique calendar year during which Chanukah and the week that stretched from Christmas Eve to the New Year were in sync. As Jaclyn also explained, "Chanukah" literally means "rededication." The bread-sharing and crumb-tossing aspects are taken from the Taslikh ritual, which takes place during Rosh Hashanah. Much of my account in this section is drawn from "Performing Across Networks," a collaboratively-written paper with Jaclyn Pryor. Because I have rewritten whole sections, I cite the paper only when I am quoting her. Jaclyn and I are frequent collaborators; in this section, I refer to her by first name to convey our familiarity. We began this "first name basis" with Jill Dolan in our collaboratively written paper "Colleague Criticism: Performance, Criticism, and Queer Collegiality."

experience appearing at First Night in Miami in 1999.[23] For the other, I could bring my familiarity with my partner's business, San Angel Folk Art, the work of the Castillo family, and my modest Spanish translation skills. Depending upon how I was used on either network, my participation had two possible outcomes. As a colleague to both Hank and Jaclyn, I might be a mere worker, someone who could be replaced by someone else who could do the same job. However, if either took advantage of my expertise, I could provide a more generative contribution. I could provide experience and budgetary advice to Jaclyn and knowledgeable sales assistance to Hank. The difference between mere connectivity and generativity is key to understanding network theories.

My first response to Jaclyn was to interrogate the logistics and the labor involved. Was it feasible to convert a blank arts space into a kitchen? Would there be any health codes preventing it? What was the budget? How long would she be awake? Was it necessary to work nonstop for so long?

My concerns about Jaclyn's output of labor followed from the scale of the proposed event. BREAD, as Jaclyn first imagined it, epitomizes what performance theorist Richard Schechner calls "a ritual-based performance." Ritual-based performances are generally marked by "pilgrimages, duration, and/or ordeals" (222).[24] In many ways the project proposed reminded me of the Depression-era dance marathons

23 At the time, my familiarity with First Night was small and really inadequate for what I would later learn from participating in BREAD. I had participated in the First Night 1999-2000 celebration in Miami, Florida. I was asked to perform thirty-five minute excerpt from my first performance piece, *Talk of the Town*. The person who hired me labeled me the "family friendly gay entry" and put me in a mixed bill evening at the Colony Theater on the Lincoln Road mall in Miami Beach. I was placed on the end of the program that started at 7 P.M. I was scheduled to go onstage at 11 P.M. The theater was a good twenty minutes walk to the beach. As is often the case, the night's program ran long. I went onstage at 11:25 P.M., and fifteen minutes into my performance, all but three of the four-hundred people in the audience left the theater to walk down to the beach for the fireworks. Following that experience, I did little to explore other First Night performance options.

24 In *Performance Theory*, Schechner writes that "performances for accidental audiences are designed to fit convenient time-slots; ritual performances allow their audience to demonstrate their devotion by pilgrimages, duration, and/or ordeals" (222).

which were featured in the film *They Shoot Horses Don't They*? (1969).[25] In the movie's portrayal, the dance marathons bartered on the participants' lack of capital; their desperation became the spectacle. My questions followed from my sense that Jaclyn's project would likewise barter both surprise and exhaustion. Later, Jaclyn explained that it was for those logistical reasons that she re-imagined the project. However, the tensions between an allegedly "simpler" past and a more complex present continued to make themselves known.

Network Defined

The word "network" has become a placeholder for the complex ways in which individuals come together in the information age, reflecting society's introjection of the technological systems that sustain our interactions (Barabási, *Linked* 1-8).[26] Among independent performers in the cultural sector, the word network often signifies how artists access and trade production opportunities, promote their projects, and expand their careers. The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines the word "network" as both noun and verb, indicating both the structure and the function of the word. The first four noun definitions describe a network as a fabric of things material (crossed wires or cords as in a "net," roads, telecommunication cables, and broadcasting entities) as well as things immaterial (such as ideas). The fifth noun definition reveals it as a structure of

[25] The film *They Shoot Horses, Don't They* is an adaptation of the 1935 novel by Horace McCoy.

[26] Albert-László Barabási's *Linked* provides an excellent and comprehensive account of how physical and social systems are linked. Barbási is a physicist at the University of Notre Dame who has written extensively on networks, at first from a mathematical standpoint and later from more social standpoints. In this chapter, I focus largely on Barbási's publications in mathematic journals and engage them with sociologist Manuel Castell's writing. I use the term "introjection" in a psychological context to refer to the ways that individuals internalize and normalize the practices involving communication technologies. Introjection is defined as 1) "the action of throwing in . . . or throwing eagerly upon some course of pursuit; and 2) "a theory whereby external objects are images of elements within the consciousness of the individual" ("Introjection").

organizations, and by extension of the people within those organizations; it also refers to individuals organized by shared associations. The four verb definitions indicate the word's semantic development alongside communication technologies. To network is 1) "to cover something" as with a net, 2) "to broadcast simultaneously over radio or television stations," 3) "to engage in social or professional 'networking,'" and 4) "to link (computers) together to allow the sharing of data, interactive operation, and efficient utilization of resources." The OED notes that the first use of broadcast networking appeared in 1952, the first use of "interpersonal networking" appeared in 1980, while the computer-based "shared network" did not appear until 1982. Interpersonal networks are sandwiched in technological developments, each flavoring the other.

Theories of networks appeared in math and the life sciences long before they were applied to human interactions. Those earlier discoveries inform the uses of "network" and "networking" today. In 1959, two Hungarian mathematicians, Paul Erdős and Alfred Renyi, coined the term "random network theory" to describe how simple communication systems could be graphed by randomly linking a number of nodes, or points of connectivity. Random network theory describes power that is distributed equally across the network through nodes that share a number of links. A breakdown of a number of nodes on a random network can effectively segmentize the entire network into discrete units, but it will not destroy the whole network. Instead, the autonomous units will continue to function as smaller networks. The U.S. Highway system is an example of a random network (Barabási and Bonabeau 60, 69-70). When I referred to myself as "a mere worker, someone who could be replaced by someone else who could do the same job," I imagined myself connected on random networks to both Jaclyn and Hank.

In 1998, four physicists at the University of Notre Dame attempted to map the World Wide Web using random network theory, based on the assumption that the

diversity of individuals and interests represented by the web would amount to a random network. Instead, they discovered that "a few highly connected [web] pages are essentially holding the worldwide web together."[27] These pages represented nodes that, through their multiple points of connectivity, had become large-scale communication exchangers, which they deemed "hubs" (62-63). When I referred to the substance of my knowledge playing a role in my assistance to Hank and Jaclyn, I was imagining myself as a hub in their respective fields, a "hub-lite," but a hub nonetheless.

The term "scale-free networks" refers to networks defined by "power laws," where hubs not only prevail as sites of power, but have the potential to reach unpredictable scale (Ibid.).[28] The worldwide web is a scale-free network; its hubs are represented by the Yahoo and Google search engines. Sexual relationships among new partners represent scale-free networks; each partner may serve as a hub, bringing previous partnerships to a moment of congress (66). Indeed, one might argue that this dissertation, with its use of a few key theorists and a number of other nodes of theory and practice, represents its own type of scale-free network, and participates in the larger network of academia. The worlds of biology and business, especially show business, are generally dominated by scale-free networks, where connectivity is harbored among a finite number of hubs. The party game "Six Degrees of Kevin Bacon," in which players

---

[27] The four physicists, Albert-László Barabási, Eric Bonabeau, Hawoong Jeong, and Reka Albert, made the following discovery: "More than 80 percent of the pages on the map had fewer than four links, but a small minority, less than 0.01 percent of all nodes, had more than 1000. (A subsequent Web survey would uncover one document that had been referenced by more than two million other pages!)" (Barabási and Bonabeau 61-62). More importantly, the four physicists' discovery correlates with Italian economist Vilfredo Pareto's Law, the "80/20 Rule," which is also known as the "Murphy's Law of Management." At first the "80/20 Rule" was used to describe how 80 percent of any product was produced by 20 percent of the labor pool; however, the phenomenon has been adapted to a wide variety of circumstances, including crime, customer service issues, and the net (Barabási 65-66).

[28] "In such networks, the distribution of node linkages follows a power law in that most nodes have just a few connections and some have a tremendous number of links. In that sense, the system has 'no scale.' The defining characteristic of such networks is that the distribution of links, if plotted on a double-logarithmic scale, results in a straight line" (Barabási and Bonabeau 69).

connect actors to Bacon via their mutual film roles, is an application of scale-network theory (Barabási 58-62).[29]

Unlike random networks, scale-free networks can anticipate and compensate for failure among a number of nodes without breaking into segments. Paradoxically, because the hubs hold so much of the exchange potential—indeed, the *power*—of networks, they are extremely vulnerable to attack. To attack a scale-free network, computer viruses transmit through hubs to numerous nodes (Barabási and Bonabeau 63-65).[30] The receptivity of hubs to attack is called the "Achilles Heel" of the scale-free network (64).

In recent years, mathematical network theory has expanded to include more research on the hierarchical tendencies of the net. In addition, mathematicians have shifted focus from the network typologies to descriptions based on properties. "Complex networks" is a more general rubric that encompasses several key properties. The "small world effect" describes the relatively short distance between any two exchange points; it is key to simple, or random, networks. The "scale-free property" describes a hub's receptiveness node connection and exchange (Dorogovtsev and Mendes 1109). Additionally, "hierarchical organization" describes high degree of clustering around hubs that exhibit scale-free properties. Heirarchical networks are generally understood as a type of complex network. The airline system with its organization of nodes (planes)

---

[29] The game proceeds from the premise that Kevin Bacon is the most connected actor in Hollywood. According to Barabási, Bacon's "average separation from everyone is 2.79 – that is, most actors are within three links of him." At 2.79, Bacon is actually 876 on the list of most connected actors. At an average separation distance of 2.53, Rod Steiger is the most connected actor in Hollywood (61-62). The notion of "six degrees of separation" was first theorized by a Hungarian poet and novelist Frigyes Karinthy, who imagined people separated by five degrees in his 1929 book of short stories, *Minden masképpen van (Everything is Different)*. In 1967, Harvard professor Stanley Milgram used Karinthy's ideas and adapted them to six degrees in his "groundbreaking" study, "The Small World Problem" (Barabási 27, 246 n. 27).

[30] According to Barabási and Bonabeau, "recent research suggests that the simultaneous elimination of as few as 5 to 15 percent of all hubs can crash a system" (65). Epidemiologists have used this information to determine how to attack cells that serve as hubs in the growth of disease. See Barabási and Oltvai, "Network Biology."

around airline hubs represents a hierarchical network, but not a scale-free one (Barabási et al., "Scale Free"; Barabási and Bonnabeau 67-68).[31]

Network theories have the potential to bring order and sense to the properties of interaction such as "fragmentation, indeterminacy," and play—what geographer David Harvey has called "the condition of postmodernity" (9). In postmodernism, as well as poststructrualism, the discursive expression of postmodernism, identity is essentially plastic and determined through appearances and interactions (Harvey 3). Identity is often used to capture human beings in the thrum of relativity, and to deconstruct the related workings of race, class, gender, region, tribe, or nation (Dolan, *Utopia* 21). Similarly, the economist and urban planner Manuel Castells sees identity as the primary source of meaning in the presence of vast global networks (*Rise* 3). Identity locates individuals and groups, but the roles we play in various networks define our relationship to production.

In *The Rise of the Network Society* (1996), Castells writes, "Networks are the fundamental stuff of which new organizations are and will be made" (168). Networks embody an ongoing technological revolution that is reshaping the "material basis of society" (1). In the "information age," communication technologies affect the substance, scale, space, and temporality of human interactions. Castells believes that the networked world order was ignited by the cultural revolutions that began in the 1960s and the economic restructurings that occurred during the 1980s, as well as the properties of communication technologies (1). Through "informationalism" (as opposed to industrialism), the postmodern forces of chaos have succumbed to the ordering tendencies of the net, effectively rejuvenating capitalism (14). The absence of statism in

[31] "Scale-Free and Hierarchical Structures in Complex Networks" paper is a collaboration among Albert-László Barabási, Zoltán Deszó, Erzsebét Ravasz, and Soon-Hyung Yook, all of the Department of Physics at Notre Dame, and Zoltán Oltavai, a biologist from Northwestern University. The scientists define a "hierarchical network" as a type of complex network with hierarchical organization, or clustering around the hubs. Hierarchical networks may or may not be scale-free.

Castells's address, the glimpse into historical materialism, and his gesture to a material basis (or base) of society allude to Castells's past as a neo-Marxist.[32]

Whereas other writers, like physicist Albert-László Barabási, follow the forms of connectivity to show the nature and abundance of human interactions in the information age, Castells predicts a future in a manner comparable to Marx and Weber (Crabtree).[33] Castells uses language that is descriptive in its own right and evocative of mathematic network theories, although his work actually predates publications on complex mathematical networks by two years. Network theories have been informed by the natural sciences and the behavioral sciences, with the terminologies drawn from mathematic and colloquial sources. The existence of hubs, for instance, was actually a by-product of Albert Einstein and Indian physicist Satyendranath Bose's "condensation effect," which theorized the structure of sub-atomic particles in 1924. Physicists used the Marxian, monopoly-like term of "the rich get richer" to describe how certain subatomic particles organized themselves in clusters around an atom (Barabási 100-102). The

---

[32] Two of Castells's critics, Jan A.G.M. van Dijk and James Crabtree, refer to Castells as a former Marxist who is attempting to capture the age in much the same way that Marx and Weber once did ("The One-Dimensional Network"; "The Last Guru?").

[33] *The Rise of the Network Society* is part one of *The Information Age*, Castells's three volume work, which includes, *The Power of Identity*, and *End of Millennium*. I focus primarily on the first book, in which Castells introduces his theses. However, I do draw from the latter texts, in which he develops his theses with respect to networks. Castells's work has been widely, though not unilaterally praised. Britain's foremost sociologist, Anthony Giddens, compares *The Information Age* work to Max Weber's *Economy and Society*. Peter Hall compares it to Marx's *Capital*. Krishan Kumar notes calls Castells's work "a true theory of networking. Brazilian President Fernando Cardoso calls it a masterpiece. Economist Jan van Dijk faults Castells for reductively conflating *all* social configurations through network structures, thereby missing the opportunity to elaborate a dialectical theory of society: "Society is pairs and groups. Networks inform but do not determine society [. . .]. Society is not technologically determined" ("The One-Dimensional"). In Volume 1, Castells actually denies that me makes this argument (*Rise* 5-7), but van Dijk asserts that Castells succumbs to it. Van Dijk concedes that Castells's work is an evocative representation of network relations. Researcher James Crabtree echoes van Dijk's hesitation when he states that the author is trying to create a masterwork equal to that of Marx and Weber. He finds the work of Castells is especially appealing to "many academics with a residual commitment to radical change," but concedes that it "is something of an imperfect roadmap [. . .] a compelling ambitious vision of society and change in the era of globalization (103). In the end, Crabtree recuperates the work as a fairly good theoretical framework from which to observe societal interactions; however, he disparages Castells's language as "aphoristic, rather than empirical" (103). In my argument, I have chosen to use Castells's descriptions to describe the structures of supporting and challenging performance production.

existence of powerful internet partnerships in the mid-1990s, the existence of vast power-outages in 1995, the spread of AIDs viruses since the 1980s, and organization of airlines availed themselves to Castells's theorization (Barabási 104; Barabási).[34]

Castells defines "the network enterprise [as] that specific form of enterprise whose system of means is constituted by the intersection of segments of autonomous systems of goals" (*Rise* 171). An individual or entity trying to employ networks will travel across spaces of opportunity connecting, dot-to-dot, goals in pursuit of a greater objective. Castells notes that there are two "fundamental attributes" of this network: "its *connectedness*, that is its structural ability to facilitate noise-free communication between its components, [and] its *consistency*, that is the extent to which there is sharing of interests between the network's goals and the goals of its components" (171; emphasis in original).

According to Castells, "space is the expression of [a] society [. . .] connected by vast global communication technologies" (*Rise* 410). Technologies exist in, illuminate, and connect this space through flows of information. Flows are the "purposeful, repetitive, programmable sequences of exchange held by social actors in the economic, political, and symbolic structures of society" (412). In this vastly networked universe, which he poetically deems "the space of flows," moments of connection take substance and form "crystallized time" (411).

To theorize the three "layers" to the space of flows, Castells borrows from mathematical network theories. The first layer consists of electronic impulses; "telecommunication technologies represent [their] material evidence" (412). The second layer consists of nodes, the "locality-based" spaces. Hubs are the communication

[34] Castells notes that he does not draw his work from "books," but from observations of trends (*Rise* 24). Interestingly, power grids are considered hierarchical, but not scale-free because they are mapped as finite contained structure. As the AIDS epidemic continues to reveal, human sexual relations are scale-free because each connection represents a replication of past sexual partners.

"exchangers" that allow for the "smooth interaction for all the elements in the network" (413). The final layer marks "the spatial organization of the dominant or managerial elites (rather than classes) that exercise the directional functions around which the space is articulated" (413-414). Underlying this third layer is the notion that societies are "asymmetrically organized," or hierarchical. Castells notes that while the space of flows allows for a certain amount of fluidity, its stability is maintained by two forces of domination working in tandem: "the articulation of the elites [and the] segmentation and disorganization of the masses." Elites are "social actors" performing a certain function, rather than being inherent "structures" of society (415). By being articulated through function and relation (as actors) and susceptible to reorganization, elites embody Mouffe's depiction of hegemony (*Democratic Citizenship* 234-235).

Technology's encumbrance on and seduction of society has been a popular theme in performance since early modernity. The Italian Futurists, the Russian Constructivists, and the Bauhaus artists presented humans morphed into machines in their stage works, suggesting that technology's dominance was imminent (Goldberg 110-116). Because of Castells's focus on connectivity and capital, I find his work useful to my own study of the capital benefits and costs facing independent performers who function through networks. More importantly, I see his network approach as an effective analytical tool for identifying the structures and dynamics of independent artists' material practices.

A Complex Moment of Crystallized Time—Being a Node, Wanting a Hub

In Jaclyn's first proposed version of BREAD, she was a sole hub in a small, though hierarchical, network defined by the nodes who would partake in BREAD. Jaclyn envisioned at least four or five helpers, who brought supplies and distributed bread, and even "kept her company" in various scenes of togetherness; however she remained its

sole organizer. As the project developed her network interactions grew into greater networks and various power laws went into effect.

The First Night Austin proposal review period lasted three months, during which times several things happened that would determine the BREAD-making process. First, the ArtHouse became unavailable, and a search for other spaces did not produce a suitable alternative. Jaclyn was told that seven hundred people applied to First Night Austin and that her project was favored but the $6,000 she had budgeted to convert the ArtHouse window into a bakery and to pay artist fees needed to be cut in half to be accepted. In the Janus-face of such flattery and such a challenge, Jaclyn felt motivated to go forward with a revised budget and proposal:

> I am used to making work on small budgets and used to, even, self-producing work, which often means paying out of pocket to realize ideas. So the fact that I was being offered a budget *at all* for this project, into which I would build my own salary, as well as that of my collaborators, was truly thrilling for me. That I was finally going to get paid for my artistic practice, that it was being recognized and valued as a form of labor, and by the city of Austin itself, made me feel as if I had "arrived" as an artist, that I had become a professional. (Bonin-Rodriguez and Pryor, "Performing Networks").

In chapter 4, "Establishing Support," I use the economic notion of "crowding theory" as a framework to consider how artists are motivated to do their work. Motivation comes from a play of extrinsic and intrinsic factors. Extrinsic motivations can be material and/or symbolic. In other words, they can be financial, social, cultural, and intellectual capital. They are often a combination of more than one kind of capital. Intrinsic

motivations are symbolic (Frey and Osterloh 78-80). In this passage, Jaclyn identifies both remuneration (financial capital) and the city's validation (social and cultural capital) as legitimizing markers of her professionalism which support her own symbolic meaning as an artist.

The symbolic meaning is summed up in the term "having arrived," a term that refers to previous work. Earlier in 2005, Jaclyn produced *floodlines*, another site-specific performance, during the Refraction Arts Festival. Jaclyn created the show in 2004 as part of her Master's thesis at the University of Texas's Performance as a Public Practice program. The site-specific *floodlines* took the form of a funeral procession that traveled through Austin's Hyde Park neighborhood. The show employed twenty-nine actors, who appeared in various tableaux vivant along the journey. The audience consisted of twenty-five people divided among five cars. As the artist-producer, Jaclyn worked with minimal funds, largely self-producing the event. The ratio of artists to audience members in *floodlines* is small. Although she was the hub in that project, and although the production had a "sold out" audience, Jaclyn's work had gone unnoticed in the greater network of Austin. A tree had fallen in the forest, and relatively few had seen. Between the past of *floodlines*, as well as the city's interest in BREAD, Jaclyn engaged in a dialectical shell game, dismissing the social and cultural capital of one project for the more social, cultural, and financial capital of another. In the exchange that became BREAD, Jaclyn hailed a hierarchical structure to capital acclaim. Also, she gestured to the value she placed on her appearance in First Night.

Through the notion of "arrival," Jaclyn marked herself as an individual artist in a greater structure defined by competition. Economists and mathematicians use the term "winner-take-all" to describe the cluster of access around a particular hub, in this case a performer (Barabási et al., "Scale-Free"). The term is also used in the arts to describe an

artist's anticipation of big returns (Jackson et al. 31). Winner-take-all idealizes "superstar" models. Superstars have achieved high levels of social, financial, cultural, and perhaps even intellectual capital. However, their interaction with a public is often worked out through financial capital—measured according to how much a public, or a funder, is willing to bank on a star. Superstars may be well-established artists or newcomers (Caves 74-77). In a field where audiences can be fickle and "demand is uncertain" (2), superstars represent something of a sure thing for a time. Economists note that much like their celestial counterparts, superstars are never really at rest. In order to maintain their status, they must play ever-larger venues or perform greater tasks in their field to expand their market share and build on their attractiveness. In the language of networks, they must become high clustering hubs. They must produce greater and greater exchanges of energy as they juggle more sites of access from more nodes, represented by employees, willing spectators, and management who work in close coordination. Economists call these teams the "motley crew." In the networks of a performer's work and career the motley crew refers to both nodes and hubs (Caves 8).

Superstars must continue to accrue and spend social, cultural, and financial capital to prove their worth in the market (74-77). Consider Madonna, the pop sensation who penned the term "material girl," becoming the founder and CEO of Maverick Records, a film actress, an author, a sexual arriviste, a film and record producer, and a newly-christened patron saint to the return of disco dancing and fashion. Her various sites of work gesture to the existence of a vast motley crew, even as it conceals their names, their identities, their influence, and their labor. From "vogue" dancers, to techno-producers, to yoga teachers, to hairstylists, these individuals come and go, attempting to use their "small world" access to Madonna to achieve greater fame. Consider Jaclyn Pryor, an artist who occupies her break from graduate school with a site-specific performance

project for which she has great plans: to realize her vision, to earn capital, and to secure her reputation as an artist who "has arrived." The project exists within the framework of a festival, and so to a certain extent, it will be carried up on the flows of the event; however, the framework will also test the extent of her ability to participate. The discourse of arrival is chimerical. It augurs urgency for the journey from process to product. Jaclyn's implied position of needing capital set up how she would use and be used by networks in the making of BREAD.

I use this example to begin a discussion about the relationship between networks and capitalism in the lives of artists. A number of neoclassical economists point out that artists are prone to spending on their work, or giving up income for the sake of seeing their visions realized. Time and expenses are drained away by all of those involved. With a focus on hiding the actual labor of their creations—labors realized through networked relations—the final performance represents a fetish of the actual event. I believe that the framework is actually larger, and informed by the circumstances of social location and urgency, all clustered around social, cultural, and financial capital that may extend beyond fame, that may actually extend to care, or just aesthetic pleasure, or the recognition of how important and ephemeral is each performance. Perhaps a form of "fame" appears as the desire to be recognized in a community of artists, where others have become elites by receiving acclaim. Perhaps the desire for recognition has a reciprocal relationship to motivation; the artist wants to work more, which the recognition of the community may support. Jaclyn claimed that her urgency came from the desire to be worthy of the budgeted fee—the most she has received in her career so far—and the approbation of the City of Austin. The urgency was also informed by her awareness that in her career so far, she has ended paying out-of-pocket for her artwork. Because she is paid as a teacher, her parents often ask about her teaching, but not her

artwork, and so the funds received from First Night Austin made her feel that she could take home a sign of her validation as an artist to her home and family (Pryor, "Interview"). All of these outcomes are informed by capital and the hierarchical structure that "acclaim" represents.

In a field circumscribed by superstar and winner-take-all circumstances, I do not fault artists for wanting to arrive. Such circumstances appear in the face of grant applications, where artists are qualified to apply after they have achieved at least two years of professional production experience (Creative Capital, "MAP"). These circumstances appear in the face of grant results and bookings, where artists see opportunities going to individuals from different geographical regions, races, classes, genders, and artistic mediums (Jackson et al., 44). I do note that acquiring and maintaining focus on one's work requires motivation from a careful balance and of internal and external forces, such as the recognition of one's own accomplishments and the support of allies, and that the awareness of networks can overwhelm artists, too.

Castells presents three main theses that reveal his ambivalence towards network technologies and illustrate the tensions between individuals and networks. He writes that "our societies are increasingly structured around the bipolar opposite between the Net and the Self" (*Rise* 3). The network could be a leviathan poised to overpower the individual. This type of powerful network appears in the vast global marketplace, where people are impoverished by the limited low-wage work options available to them or deprived of means of support because a cheaper alternative has been found, or manufacturers have been forced to lower prices.[35] Among independent performers, the network-as-leviathan may appear as the winner-take-all market and the superstar model. The leviathan may

[35] In the *Condition of Postmodernity*, David Harvey paints a similar image. Charles Fishman writes a compelling account of how the global marketplace serves as a network to the detriment of workers in *The Wal-Mart Effect*.

appear where a significant number of presenters set a particular price, or even where the existence of certain programs or programmatic conditions interface with individual consciousness and discourage artists from thinking of suitable or radical alternatives.[36] In Jaclyn's case, the First Night enterprise represented its own kind of leviathan, one that she wanted to please.

As I would later learn, BREAD epitomized the civic-minded structure and artistic function of projects sought by First Night International, a network of First Night celebrations that comprise the event. First Night Austin 2005 marked the city's inaugural participation in the First Night International movement. The original First Night was introduced during the 1976 Bicentennial Celebration "by a group of civic-minded artists in Boston as a meaningful alternative to traditional New Year's Eve revelry." First Night events stress four cultural aspects: "community, celebration, the New Year, and the arts" (First Night International, "About"). In 2005, 108 cities in the United States, as well as the cities of Whistler, British Columbia, and Auckland, New Zealand, held First Night celebrations ("First Night Cities").[37] First Night International serves as the coordinating network organization for these celebrations. It offers guidelines, technological and marketing support, and an annual conference for its attendees. First Night International stresses equally the value of art in neighborhood and city revitalization. First Night stresses the importance of art in the New Year and the importance of artists' civic duty. At its annual conference, two of its four awards are decidedly against financial capital: 1) the award for volunteers and 2) the Golden Shoestring Award, which awards projects

[36] As I argue throughout this dissertation, while many artists are considered creative thinkers, they work in a discursive framework that often influences, if not determines, the substance of their interactions.

[37] The mission of First Night International reads: "First Night seeks to foster the public's appreciation of visual and performing arts through an innovative, diverse and high quality New Year's Eve program which provides a shared cultural experience, accessible and affordable to all" ("About"). First Night boasts of "110 celebrations worldwide"; however, the bulk of these celebrations are held in the northeastern states of Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Virginia ("First Night Cities").

with budgets under $300 and under $600. The value of this network exerted a controlling influence on Jaclyn's project. It committed BREAD to a certain type of organization and ethos; one of "giving" ("Awards We Present").

Castells second and third theses confirm the net's exclusionary potential through an examination of place. Communications technologies lead to a dispersal of access. Social movements, global institutions, labor and capital share virtual spaces across different time zones. Castells addresses this splitting of presence as a "split between function and meaning," where communication technologies actually lead to distancing rather than connection (*Rise* 423). In this space of multiple places across time zones, there is "timeless time," which leads to a culture of "real virtuality" (464). Human beings fluctuate between abstraction and reality depending on their connection to production—specifically, how their production becomes manifest in its arrival. Outside of work, identity becomes key to an individual's legitimacy within a group, to protest movements, and to projects that work for a future against the crushing forces of globalism (Castells, *Power* 7-9). The struggle for presence is dissipated by a split between function and meaning. This final thesis relates to the inclusion and exclusion of different people—people in groups, in communities, in economies—that are easily turned on and off through their relation to their production (*End* 80-83).[38] The network's ambivalent appeal becomes apparent through its uses by individuals and of individuals as they try to tame or resist it—or, as they succumb to it.

Scale-Free Property—Being a Hub

While considering how to re-imagine her project, Jaclyn saw the 2005 movie *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory*, which was a remake of the 1971 movie, *Willie*

[38] Castells devotes much of *End of the Millennium* to this second thesis (75-85).

Wonka and the Chocolate Factory. In the film, six golden tickets are placed in chocolate bars and sent out across the chocolate-transporting networks of the world. One of those tickets is received by Charlie, a British boy who lives in a squalid, drafty house with his decrepit grandparents and his chronically underemployed parents. On Charlie's birthday, he finds a pound note and purchases a bar of chocolate which happens to have a golden ticket. The moment represents for Charlie's family a moment of what Jaclyn has called "radical magic, a shift in their otherwise bleak fortunes."[39] Jaclyn said this directly influenced her final conception of BREAD. The "golden ticket" in this case was the bread itself, to be delivered by "Bread faeries" and sealed with golden twist-ties that bound together series of messages identifying who brought the bread and that the recipients were invited to a celebration in which to share the bread and then toss crumbs into the river. Through acts of sharing and of letting go, they would model a process of resolution for the coming year, what Jaclyn called "a rededication."

Had I known about the movie's influence at the time, I might have been compelled to ask, "At what price magic?" Jaclyn's project relied on the illusion of the improbable within a greater framework of the possible. The movie, of course, was a perfect model to consider the labor of performance. In the movie, the reclusive Willy Wonka lives in a candy factory with thousands of identical Oompa Loompas who produce his candy, which is shipped out across the world. The presence of gold tickets

[39] Jaclyn writes: "My favorite part of the film is the footage of the golden ticket production and distribution system—in this factory of Oompa Loompas and chocolate rivers, billions upon billions of bars get made, wrapped, boxed, and sent around the world. I love that moment, in particular, when the armored trucks first depart for distribution: to Tokyo, New York, Paris, etc. Everyone wants a golden ticket, and everyone—very allegorically speaking, of course—has as chance to win. Hope and faith, desire and love trump cleverness and cunning, wealth and envy—and Charlie becomes our hero. And I'll be the first to admit, in spite of my recognition of the less enchanted ways in which culture gets played out in everyday life, an investment in this kind of magical thinking" ("Performing Networks"). I would add that luck plays a role too. Charlie's risky investment pays off, making for a very good birthday. Jaclyn's account echoes her own feeling of being chosen by the First Night committee. Finding the gold ticket, Charlie "arrives," too. His accomplishment amounts to a first step in his ultimate escape from squalor.

inspires a chocolate buying frenzy—one child who gets a ticket has her father purchase countless boxes until one can be found. The apparent outcome of the event, much like a theater work, would depend on backstage operations that were vast and laborious.

The role that Jaclyn gave herself for BREAD, as well as *floodlines*, was that of artist-producer. Artist-producer roles reveal the plasticity of identity in the face of network organizing, where roles get conflated in the course of function. By taking on the producing duties, the independent performing artists serve as hubs to their own projects, while executive producers or presenters oversee a greater function. In Jaclyn's case, the First Night Austin organization served as the executive producer, just as the Refraction Arts Festival served as the executive producer for her earlier work. In a complex network, artist-producer hubs command a large amount of power. Because they hold so much of the production capacity, they are also vulnerable to attack. As long as long as they function, the show goes on. As long as they stay-in-the game, "artist-producers" will find tasks growing and labors building in the effort to connect more nodes.

Two weeks prior to the production (the week before Christmas), I called Jaclyn to ask how the project was going. Jaclyn told me that she was concerned about participation, since participation is the essence of the project. She did not feel that Tate Austin, the publicist hired by First Night Austin, was giving adequate focus to BREAD. She wanted to hire a publicist but could not afford it. I reminded her that the week was a big one for bakeries and suggested that she put fliers at Texas French Bread, where her actual loaves were being produced. Jaclyn informed me that, much to the dismay of the bakery, she did not want to associate the BREAD bread with its actual makers. Instead, she wanted people to assume by its appearance and wrapping that it was made by a baker—and therefore safe—but she wanted the absence of corporate branding to hail an

earlier era of human connectivity, when she imagined that bread was made and shared regularly.

As Jaclyn explained to me, her project was inspired by a photograph of her maternal and paternal great-great-grandmothers and a great-great aunt.[40] She imagined them breaking bread together and wanted to do a project that brought people together to break bread. In this moment, Jaclyn's project was caught between two networks, one of virtuality, the other of reality. The virtual was part of the network of signs and symbols that hailed an image of an earlier era. It was based on nostalgia for a simpler time. Kathleen Stewart has argued nostalgia is essentially a conservative movement that seeks to fit the past into what one imagines it to have been: "[n]ostalgia rises to importance as a cultural practice as culture becomes more and more diffuse, more a more a 'structure of feeling'" (227). Jaclyn's theater of the nostalgic functioned as a counterpoint to the structure of feeling attending a culture of "real virtuality." Through virtuality, however, Jaclyn threatened to abstract the labors of all those who participated. The two women in the photo become virtual stand-ins for the actual bakers, for the Texas French Bread Corporation, whose participation was symbolically networked out, and for the many bread faeries and packers and organizers who would participate. In this space of crystallized time, real identities were traded. Function separated from meaning and into play. At same time, it revealed the draw of nostalgia for a simpler time in the face of complex networked relations.

This play on function and meaning continued through the promotion, as Jaclyn used network technologies to draw attention to the work. Later, Jaclyn emailed me to ask

---

[40] The photograph can be found at http://bread2006.blogspot.com/2005/12/bakers.html (Pryor, "The Bakers."). The photograph depicts three women standing side-by-side, not actually baking. Next to it, another photograph depicts two hands stirring a mixture in a bowl that is balanced over another bowl. Jaclyn has included the actual bakers' photographs in our conference presentation, "Performing Networks: A Reading Across Disciplinary, Imaginary, and Material Boundaries."

about getting the word out. Feeling challenged by the restrictions of her vision, I suggested she access the space of flows through a weblog. She emailed back that she already had one and gave me the link, www.bread2006.blogspot.com. Still trying to respond—perhaps even feeling my pride in my own hubness diminishing in recognition of and in competition with Jaclyn's capability—I told her that I had been fantasizing about radical ways to promote my own work, ways that transcend the standard forms of broadcast which I find emotionally draining. I suggested to Jaclyn that we start a Craigslist posting chain on "Missed Connections."

Craigslist is "a non-commercial community bulletin board with classifieds and discussion forums" founded in March 1995 by Craig Newmark, a San Francisco Bay Area "Web-oriented software engineer" ("Craigslist Management"). "Missed Connections" is a link within the personals section that allows people who have spotted individuals or lost connections to make a bid for attention. I read "Missed Connections" frequently because the narrative quotient is high, and because I find a certain voyeuristic thrill, and because, like many people I know, I would love to see myself described in glowing terms: "You were at Texas French Bread, and you were typing furiously on your overly large laptop about the existence of 'networks.' That black sweater looks good." The cache of something like "Missed Connections" is its ability to personalize anonymous space without compromising the anonymity of the individual. An individual's identity on the network is hermetically sealed in a description of crystallized time. It can be unsealed by happenstance (or discovery) and choice.

At the time, I posited that "Missed Connections" represented a great opportunity for a performer wanting to construct intrigue about an event.[41] Jaclyn did not discourage

[41] Of course, not all such technologies are similarly constructed. Friendster.com and MySpace.com represent two technologies that encourage and pursue the divulsion of identities and affinities through networks of web-linked communities. Looming on the immediate horizon is Dodgeball, a technology that combines the personal weblog technologies of Friendster and MySpace with a tracking device and cell

me, so I made my posting pretending to be an elderly man who could not drive. I told Jaclyn that it was good to meet her at Texas French Bread and that her project—which I described—sounded so interesting. I asked her to remind me of the name of the project. I told her and that my niece would be driving me to the event, so could I please have the time, date, and place, too?

Proud of my work, I called Jaclyn's house to tell her to check "Missed Connections." Her partner, Karen, answered and told me that Jaclyn was into BREAD full-time now. She was designing and copying the 2,006 tags for the bread that would be delivered on doorsteps; these tags included instructions for participation and a poem about the project that Jaclyn had commissioned poet Abe Louise Young to write. Jaclyn was negotiating bread costs and working out the baking and packing schedule with Texas French Bread. She was buying packaging supplies. She was sending out press releases. She had hired a Klesmer band to play at the final BREAD ceremony. Jaclyn was beginning to identify and map the neighborhoods where individuals would get BREAD, and she was gathering a legion of faeries to do the work—wasn't I going to be one? She was trying to figure out alternative ways to plug the show. Jaclyn lived, ate, and did not sleep because of BREAD. I sensed exhaustion from Karen. From her account, the space of flows was not so much a stream, but a running track. Jaclyn was in a constant marathon mode. In a short space of time, she was trying to become a highly-clustered hub coordinating vast nodes. Castells has pointed out that "the network society is characterized by the breaking down of rhythmicity, either biological or social, associated with the notion of a lifestyle." Work is not limited to the hours of daylight. Work, urgent and demanding, can come at any moment (*Rise*, 423). Similarly, Jaclyn planned to access 2,006 individuals directly in Austin and a greater number among those who would

---

phone telephone numbers so that individuals sharing affinities or mutual friendships can be alerted when they are in proximity to each other (Johnson,"Emerging Technology").

join the final ceremony. Once she got into process, she found the details growing exponentially. From within, the network appeared scale-free. The network-as-leviathan appeared in the myriad of tasks still looming. She would take care of these tasks in unrestricted "timeless time." All of a sudden, my contributions seemed very small.

Listening to Karen's account of Jaclyn's work, I reflected on how many times I had been in a similar situation as an artist-producer. I realized that when envisioning a project, I generally underestimated the amount of time, labor, personnel, and money needed. Planning was often dreaming. My theatrical imagination took into account the access that networks, but it generally abstracted time, labor, and costs that my networks demanded.[42]

Jaclyn contacted me later to tell me that my Craigslist posting was "really creepy" and that she was not going to respond to it—in effect, she was breaking the posting chain. I felt negated, dismissed, and silly for trying. The emotional labor I invested became clear to me. Clearly, this contribution was not part of Jaclyn's vision of BREAD. As the artist-producer, such a choice was Jaclyn's prerogative, but in cutting him off, Jaclyn disrupted what I envisioned as my character's network function. Although only a figment, the elderly male character had attempted to become a hub of intrigue, whose kind and benign attentions embodied the civic participation invited by First Night Austin.

I realized, too, that he took the form of an odd, powerless male who could not get himself to the event—someone whose hopes rose in a chance bakery encounter—and that this was almost antithetical to the mobility required of Jaclyn to create BREAD. Perhaps he was even antithetical to the mobility needed for the final parade. In that moment of crystallized time, his identity stood out. Perhaps it troubled the associations of an earlier

[42] Recently, when writing grants, I have begun to budget for what I anticipate the real costs will be. My grants have not been successful, and so I fear I am making myself available to critiques of "budget inflation." I will discuss these grants in my chapters on support and entrepreneur.

era; perhaps it even troubled more conservative discourses of gender. In either case, he was now dispensable. His disappearance was easily facilitated by the "lean production" of the net, which easily accesses more suitable workers (*Rise*, 153).

Upon greater reflection, I realized that Jaclyn's recognition of creepiness represented a greater societal ambivalence towards networks as informed by the randomness of "Missed Connections." All those mentions of black sweaters and suggestions of get-togethers amount to a dominant layer of the "down low"—the back room, the dark alley, and the cruise zone. This space of flows is viscous with human needs making themselves known. The real virtuality of the web cultivates a suspicion, an anti-humanist one, that makes us conflate the moment of absence (of a known person) and presence (of his needs) on pathological terms. We are sure we know that unknown person enough to not trust him.[43] I did not know how this distrust would bode for those who received bread on their doorstep.

As these comments reveal, my competitive feelings had emerged in full force. As a friend and an artist, I had been invited into Jaclyn's structure of urgency, and I had come trying to be someone "in the know." The structure of feeling that informed our interactions was influenced by the flows of capital—distrust, competition, urgency, and judgment were actively lived and felt. I seemed to demand a certain amount of recognition for my experience and contributions. Jaclyn's demands were increasing too. Some of these, she placed on others, and some of these she placed on herself; however, all of them were relational to the network of her own project, and the presence of her project in the program of First Night.

---

[43] The recent lawsuit against Craigslist reported in the March 5, 2006 edition of *The New York Times* reveals this paradox of interaction. Recent Craigslist classifieds have featured individuals advertising for roommates and specifically requesting No Arabs, African-Americans, Men, or "Only Christians." A Chicago fair housing group has filed suit under the Fair Housing Act. Craigslist argues that the Communications Decency Act of 1996 states that "online companies are not liable for transmitting unlawful materials supplied by others" (Liptak 4:16).

High Cluster Returns and Costs—Moments of Crystallized Time

At some point in the last week, the nodes positioned to support BREAD were polished and returned to an efficient conductivity and aimed directly at Jaclyn. With Christmas out of the way by Sunday, Jaclyn's week began with television interviews and with an *Austin American-Statesman* feature on BREAD in a greater profile of First Night Austin. Radio interviews were forthcoming right through the day of the event. Jaclyn's blog was listed and visited. The excitement built, and the volunteer pool filled up as well. Jaclyn gathered friends and colleagues to help her. Strangers wrote in and volunteered. One such contact played hub to four different Girl Scout Troops who came to Jaclyn's house to assemble the now four-part labels.[44] In the space of her dining room, the labor and laborers required for this one task was completely apparent for a moment, and then the scout leader took the troop to her own house to finish the work. Jaclyn was always at the center of her event, working diligently to make its ever growing network produce.

Along with some volunteers, Jaclyn took to the streets to promote BREAD in a grassroots fashion. Dressed in white—the color of the faeries' costume—she and several bread faeries traveled throughout Austin writing messages on the street. The messages interrupted the culture of real virtuality by being urgent, ephemeral, and dramatic, perhaps even messianic: "Bread is coming/Prepare"; "Will you be chosen?"; "December 31st/Check your doorstep"; "Loaves will be torn open like love letters." The last line was

[44] Designed by Jaclyn, the tags were elaborately constructed. There were four squares of various sizes and shapes. The tags branded the project, BREAD, and name its four basic components—"Receive. Gather. Share. Resolve." They invited recipients to attend the final bread-breaking ceremony downtown that evening. They instructed participants to wear white. Abe Louise Young's poem was included. The tags were looped onto a gold twist-tie.

excerpted from the poem by Abe Louise Young. The messages across the city suggested that material evidence of human connectedness was coming, a golden ticket of sorts. The messianic tinge seemed to signify a need for salvation in the struggle between the network and the self. To those who considered the labor, the chalk messages implied that network forces were hard at work—and hidden. For some, the messages indicated that something strange was about to happen. For others, they were one more bit of evidence of eccentricity in a city where the motto is "Keep Austin Weird."[45]

A Picture of a Hierarchical Network

I arrived at Texas French Bread on the evening of December 30th with my friend Ginny in tow. Ginny is an art collector who resides in Denver, Aspen, Santa Fe, and New York City. We are friends and hubs in each other's lives. I occasionally consult for her foundation, and her homes give me access to retreat (in Santa Fe, mostly) and work (in New York). Ginny frequently refers to the "art world" in which she works as if it is the only one that exists, where artistic projects are necessarily commodities and arts collectors, such as herself, receive acclaim for their arts support in a way that theater supporters do not. Ginny's participation would help me see the network functions at work and help me reconsider the distinctions between visual art and performing arts.[46]

When Ginny and I arrived, we found Jaclyn marshalling about ten people in the dining area of Texas French Bread. Tables had been scattered helter-skelter. Trays of

[45] "Keep Austin Weird" is a slogan that has been used, according to some, since the 1970s, to characterize Austin's unique brand of hipness. Red Wassenich, a librarian at Austin Community College, claims to have invented the slogan and printed bumper-stickers to that effect in 2000 (Kelso). The slogan inspired Zachary Scott Theater's production of *Keepin' It Weird* (2005) by Dave Steakley, an original production of dialogue and movement based on "quasi-ethnograph[ies]" of Austin residents (Cole).

[46] In *Pricing the Priceless*, economist William Grampp argues that the artist economy differs little from that of other enterprises. Grampp writes only about the visual art medium, which produces a commodity that can be easily copyrighted, bartered, and sold (38-41).

bread were stacked across them, along with the packaging materials. Faeries were hard at work bagging bread. They wore rubber gloves, according to the codes of the Health Department. They placed the bread in plastic bags. They sealed the bread with tags that were carefully cut and layered by Jaclyn and by unseen Girl Scout hands.

Jaclyn was assertive and direct as she showed us where to wash our hands and put on gloves. She gave her instructions in a way that was both no-nonsense and fun: do this, do this, do this, she said. Ginny ignored these comments. She did not wash her hands; she did not stay with the baggers. She went to the kitchen and joined the bakers who had actually been trained to do their work. Ginny touched the dough. She was a non-cooperative node. I joined in the bagging. Some colleagues from school, Rebecca, Clare, and Thomas, and Thomas's friend, Ryan, had arranged themselves into a virtual assembly line. Ryan and Tom were placing bread into plastic bags. Clare and Rebecca were attaching labels and placing the loaves into paper sacks. When one or the other group got ahead of another, the individuals shifted jobs to keep the tasks functioning. The assembly-line model gave way to the network, where functions are autonomous, but malleable and interchangeable, and where identity is plastic, as determined by task. I joined them as a bread-bagger/packer (Castells, Rise 171; Harvey 7).

We had been segmented to function in Jaclyn's hierarchical BREAD network. Had a significant number of us become, like Ginny, curious and unwilling to follow our function as proscribed by Jaclyn, we could have disrupted her BREAD-making. But Ginny was only one non-cooperative node. Because the rest of us continued to operate according to Jaclyn's instructions, Ginny's disappearance into the kitchen did not make a difference in the greater scheme. Her absence did reveal that Jaclyn had become a more-powerful hub by organizing through less elite hubs. The bakers clustered around a kitchen bread-baking hub and worked around Ginny. We clustered around the bread-

packing hub and worked together. We managed to bag the bulk of the baked bread. Ginny and I left at 11 P.M. and promised to return at 4:30 AM to bag the remainder of the bread that the bakers finished overnight.

The next morning, I found the bakery filled with BREAD fairies, ages eight to fifty. These individuals were dressed in white and ready to have fun. Everyone was costumed according to Jaclyn's instructions: festive and theatrical and layered to accommodate the weather. There were twice as many baggers as the night before. There were additional organizers assigning the neighborhoods.

With more people and more going on, Jaclyn had to be more available for leading, delegating, and finally delivering bread herself. She told me she had not slept more than an hour. When Jaclyn realized that we had actually bagged some "dented" loaves that Jaclyn wanted to return, I tried to offer a little performer-to-performer advice: "Just let it go," I said.

"I can't let it go," she replied.

Within minutes of leaving the bakery to make deliveries, we realized that we were 400 shy of the 2006 loaves. I repeated my comment: "Just let it go."

Jaclyn turned on me, "Stop telling me to let it go!"

As Ginny and I drove through dark streets and then got out to leave bread on doorsteps, I thought about the costs of the network for individual artists and the paradoxes at work in this particular "performance." BREAD was based on a conception of a simpler time; but it used complex contemporary networking technologies. Because the concept was virtual and the labor was real, the labor was apparent only to those of us who were working in production and only in the segments (or clusters) of our function.

"Let it go." I said the words out of concern for Jaclyn's well-being. She was expensing great physical, financial, and emotional labors, and so were the participants.

Would 400 loaves have mattered if we kept quiet? Could the symbolic concept of 400 loaves in the proposal and planning stand in for the work already done, since 400 loaves suggested that 20 percent of the delivery work still needed attending to after all the loaded loaves were delivered?

I realized that I was projecting my experience onto Jaclyn. I first took the hyphenate role of artist-producer for reasons of economy. I saw myself as deficient in all forms of capital. I had a minimum experience. I thought I had to arrange all things to understand their components. I was sensitive about sharing unfinished work. I took on as much labor as I could, often to my own exhaustion. However, in holding on to my individuated role, I did not recognize all of the people really supporting me, those I turned to in need. Jump-Start Performance Co., the theater company where I make work, is now in its twenty-first year. The company stands because of all the staff, board, and company members, past and present, who have given many forms of capital. Over time, I have learned to raise as much support as I can, and to pay as many collaborators as I can manage. I rely on colleagues. In doing so, I have expanded the responsibilities of others in my networks, but my awareness has come from the necessity of needing to share the burden and knowing that I must plan to do so.

Jaclyn had envisioned this project in ambitious proportions and scale, as benefiting a networked society, and the network demanded energy and organization to function. Jaclyn had taken on the role of an extremely powerful hub and found herself exhausted and habitual to the point of not being able to "let it go." Acclaim came to land on the person who represented the work—Jaclyn. This power came at great costs and sacrifice given the multiple roles she had maintained. Jaclyn's exhaustion and her abstraction of others' labors revealed a need for an ethos in the face of network functions, one that meted out credit and work to the benefit of all.

The morning was briskly cold. I had not brought my white coat. I was running to keep warm. As I was placing a loaf of bread on the porch of a house on a street where I often stayed while in graduate coursework, a woman's voice startled me, "Oh my God, am I a chosen one?"

I jumped and looked. The woman wore a white bathrobe and sat on a lawn chair, reading the newspaper by the pale bits of streetlight that filtered down through the trees. Her hair was wet. I assume she was kept warm by the ember of her cigarette.

I replied, "Yes, you are."

"I'm so excited," she said. "I went to bed hoping I would be chosen."

This was not the last time I experienced such a warm welcome although most people wore coats that morning. The network function carefully laid into place in the weeks leading up to the event had sent the signal, in ever increasing impulses, through hubs to nodes across the city. As Jaclyn imagined, the bread seemed to touch a nerve. It served as a symbol of human connection in a vastly networked age. Ginny and I left bread on doorsteps and passed it out at stoplights and along the very congested Congress Avenue Bridge. Those that expected the bread were grateful. A journalist wrote about the bread I left on her doorstep; a radio deejay related the story on air the following Monday of finding his bread. Those who did not expect the bread seemed to receive it with warmth. Perhaps they could feel our excitement in connecting with them in real time and shared space.

Early in my route, Jaclyn called. A bread faerie had not shown up and so she was delivering, too, in between a radio interview and negotiating with the bakery for the additional loaves. She had decided she would take the 400 loaves down to the parade route and distribute them there. Now she needed to get wheelbarrows to wheel the bread around. Did I know anyone who had a wheelbarrow? I told her I did not.

Because Ginny and I were tired and wanted to return to my home in San Antonio, we did not attend the final celebration. By Jaclyn's account, over 300 people showed up wearing white for the BREAD portion of the parade that night. They joined 10,000 revelers in celebrating First Night Austin (Van Ryzin, "First Night"). On her blog, Jaclyn created a "BREAD SPEAKS" page and invited participants to send in their stories. Fifteen individuals responded. Some spoke of their anticipation of BREAD and their glee in finding it. They told of their children being showered by confetti or gifted with bread during the BREAD procession. They told of the personal significance of the white clothing they wore, the magic they felt in finding BREAD and participating, the relief they felt in tossing away the crumbs of the previous year. The playwright, Steve Moore, who knows Jaclyn, did not go to the parade but wrote at-length about the meaning of the event to him and his son:

> Hey Jaclyn,
>
> Just a word to say how fantastic this whole thing was. I was lucky enough to get a loaf on Saturday morning, and Sam (10yrs.) and I munched it all day. It was such a joy to explain the idea to him, with all its energy, randomness, and open-hearted generosity. I saw his eyes take fire and felt that he'd seized the deeper understanding of it. These days I want so much for him to be exposed to love that extends itself not just from person to person, but from one person (or a group of people) out into the whole community, and especially gestures that say "we are here together and we must take care of each other, not only with food or money or even compassion, but by surprising and delighting and changing each other for

> the good." Thank you for that. It was a gift far greater than the bread. (Letter).

Moore credits the event with making human connectivity evident to his son. In doing so, he implicitly refers to the virtuality of the information age conferring the virtue of BREAD.

Jaclyn's budget narrative tells how she was drained by the network. Jaclyn's budgeted income, as determined by the city, was $3,000. At the time of her original budget proposal of $6,000, she hoped to make $1,000. When the revised budget came back, Jaclyn still hoped to make some money, but she could not be sure how much. Her final expenses ended up to be $3,800 in out-of-pocket money. A portion of that, $500, covered her cell phone usage for December. Consequently, she donated back her fee ($1,000) plus $800 (Bonin-Rodriguez and Pryor, "Performing").

I asked Jaclyn to consider that the faeries were not paid or reimbursed for their expenses—which included donated time, automotive wear-and-tear, gas, costumes, a hotel (mine), and babysitters. Jaclyn told me that when her budget was greater, or still intact, she had commissioned the poem for $500. She hoped to reimburse faeries, too, but could not in the end. Jaclyn said that she ended up drawing from accounts in a "barter economy." She relied a lot on Dustin Wills, student and the director of a local theater company, for whom she had taught a number of workshops at no cost. She owes the poet, Abe Louise Young, her direction in a show. She anticipated returning the favor to other performers. She and I continue to collaborate. In the end, Jaclyn recognized that Texas French Bread had scored a financial loss by under-budgeting their expenses and by not getting more acclaim for their baking, but she did not indicate that she would have changed her approach (Telephone Interview). Jaclyn's comments revealed that the

network accessed and hid labors during production, and that there are still labors hiding. It revealed that she is still negotiating forms of capital in her own developing ethos.

While Ginny was visiting and performing in BREAD, she and I argued about grants and subsidies. Ginny is against them. She believes that artists should earn every penny. I explained that performance, which is rooted in the ephemeral, is nothing like the industry she knows. *Ars longa* ("art lasts") is the term given to describe how artworks earn revenues over the long run.[47] For performance, *ars longa* takes effect through the production of a replicable medium, such as a film or book, or a commercial run (as in an Off-Broadway theater). On its own merits, Jaclyn's performance, which was large and civic-minded, did not offer access to the principle of *ars longa*. BREAD followed more along the genre lines of "happenings," the performance art events staged in galleries by Allen Kaprow, Carolee Schneemann, and Vito Acconci, among others, in the early 1970s. Those events were meant to counter the commodity focus of modern art with something more ephemeral and radical (Goldberg 130-138). A counter-example to BREAD is found in Christo's *The Gates*, the 2005 project in which the French artist and his spouse, Jeanne-Claude, erected a field of saffron colored drapes in Central Park for one month. Christo raised $20 million for his $8 million project by selling drawings of his concept (McIntire). As someone whose collection includes several of Christo's works, I wondered later if Ginny would see a distinction between anti-commodity focus of happenings, and the commodity tie-in modeled by Christo today. Upon greater reflection, I wondered about the structure that informed my own argument, and Jaclyn's decisions. As the actual costs of the event grew, Jaclyn's financial capital was drained away, and the need to budget became more apparent. But more importantly, her first budget,which was $6,000, had been close to representing the time and labor actually

[47] From the Latin term, "*vita brevis, ars longa.*" Translation: "Life is short; art lasts" (Caves 8-9).

spent. Had Jaclyn earned $6,000 from First Night Austin or from a variety of sources, she might have been able to make greater remuneration.

The experience wrought from BREAD production benefited Jaclyn's career with respect to First Night and perhaps the greater community. Jaclyn was nominated for an award at the Annual Conference. Many of the individuals who responded to her website ask if she will repeat it next year. The question remains, would she be able to foresee the ways in which time, effort, and money worked themselves out across the networks of production? Would she be able to gather performers who are equally committed? Would she be able to wield her experience to state her real costs to the First Night enterprise, or will she find other sponsors? Would BREAD as it is conceived, accommodate the demands of sponsors, and the expectations that its vastly networked efforts begat? Would she be interested in replicating its original structure or would she feel compelled to revise it?

Jaclyn's story indicates that networks can serve an artist's work, but they can also make possible an ambitious production scale that tests the resources of the artist-producer. It also shows how artists need to be realistic about the artist-producer role in the network functions. In its conception, the nostalgia of BREAD was almost dialectically oppositional to its materialities, complicating its outcomes and contributing to the abstraction of labor. Through their complex structures and seeming efficiency, networks connote a certain amount of ease; and yet they can also require vast amounts of energy. To be conscious of their networks, independent performers need to have a meta-awareness of their participation in networks, as well as their colleagues. As vast shifting structures of interactivity that travel simultaneously from perception to practice and back again, as well as from interactive site to site, networks forever test the outer limits of

human participation, presence, and absence. A consciousness about them requires one to think across time and space, and the different forms of capital being traded between them.

THE NATIONAL PERFORMANCE NETWORK

In this section, I examine the National Performance Network (NPN), an organization founded on the idea of a "random network" and developed as a "hierarchical network." The NPN appeared at a time when the word "network" had entered actively into contemporary discourse; from the beginning it sought to use the awareness of networks as a means to make systemic address to issues facing the nation's cultural landscape. In 1985, Dance Theater Workshop (DTW) Executive Director (now retired) David White invited fourteen "artist-centered" presenting organizations to discuss a national dilemma: namely, a condition of "artistic isolation [experienced by] independent artists and cultural organizers throughout the U.S." (*Directory* 5). From that first meeting, the NPN emerged as an umbrella project of DTW. The membership consisted of presenting organizations, called "NPN Partners." The NPN established itself as a coordinating entity, providing both a centralized funding source and a space for the exchange of artistic resources among partners. Funds were secured from the Joyce Mertz Gilmore Foundation, the Culpepper Foundation, and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. In 1998, the NPN became its own nonprofit organization under the direction of San San Wong, and moved to San Francisco, where Wong resides. In 2000, M.K. Wegman assumed the role of "President and C.E.O." and the National Office relocated to New Orleans where Wegman resides (*Directory* 5).

According to its mission statement, "The National Performance Network (NPN) is a group of diverse cultural organizers, including artists, working to create meaningful partnerships and to provide leadership that enables the practice and public experience of

the performing arts in the United States" (*Directory* 4).[48] Through its mentorship in the creation of and ongoing associations with LA RED (Red de Promotores Cultures de Latinoamerica y el Caribe), CAN Dance (Canadian Dance Network), Japanese Contemporary Dance Network, and the Nationeles Performance Netz in Germany, the NPN supports international touring (*Directory* 5). In addition, the NPN founded the National Arts Mentoring Partnership Program (NAMPP), which plays an ongoing role in "nurturing a generation of imaginative, progressive leaders [as] artists and presenters" and the "Collaborative Subsidy Project" with the Network of Cultural Centers of Color (NCCC), which supports the presentation of artists of color (*Directory* 5). Through its programming, as well as its support of allied organizations, the NPN seeks to play a broad role in cultural policy development (17). As the statement indicates, in its twenty-one years of existence, the NPN has expanded to become an organization that exerts a broad, even global, cultural influence. In all of its programs and initiatives, the NPN performs according to Castells's fundamental attributes of a network. It maintains an essential connectedness of autonomous parts and facilitates noise-free communication among those parts (*Rise* 171). In this section, I will focus on its Core Programs which affect artists directly and follow the organization's original mission; but first, I'd like to offer some background.

In early 1996, I was appointed to the NPN's "Steering Committee." The Steering Committee was the name given to the organization's board when it was still an umbrella project of DTW. Its membership consisted of two Representatives from each of the NPN's four regions, two Artist Representatives, as well as one representative each from

[48] The NPN calls its presenters "artist centered"; however, among the partners, several organizations consider themselves artist-run, including Jump-Start Performance Co., Pregones Theater of the Bronx, a Puerto-Rican theater company that presents other artists as well, and Cultural Odyssey, an organization in the San Francisco Bay area that presents "original performance work [. . .] that is firmly rooted in African American music, dance and theatrical traditions" (*Directory* 15-23).

two identity caucuses, the People of Color Caucus and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) Caucus. Identity caucus representatives did not have to be NPN Partners, and so I was appointed as a representative of the LGBT Caucus.

In the fall of 1996, at my first NPN annual membership meeting as a Steering Committee Representative, White asked the NPN to become its own organization. For the next year, I participated in a planning process with the organization, attending meetings in New York and Houston, writing the Mission and Values statements—which have since been replaced—and participating in repeated conference calls as I served on various committees. In 1997, the NPN became its own nonprofit organization with tax-exempt status. I served on the Board as an Artist Representative until 2000, when my term expired.

For the most part, independent artists are not part of the NPN membership, or NPN partners, since they are not presenting organizations; consequently, the artist leadership position represents an exception in the organization's structure. My experiences as an artist at the table have found me challenged by what it meant to "represent" artists from across the nation and overwhelmed by the responsibility. Even after four years on the board, I was not sure of what I could assert on behalf of artists in an organizational culture that talked of increasing artist access while it adhered to the guidelines of its original Core Programs. I felt as if I had been given a voice when writing the Mission and Value Statements. But the absence of other artists, and the abundance of partners, during the voting sessions of the Annual Meetings made me feel that my participation was, if not token, then certainly unique, and dismissible. My experiences made me want to understand more about the material workings of the field. Indeed, the NPN's influence has contributed directly to this document.

The NPN's broad geographical reach facilitates support of the nation's performance infrastructure, as well as artists touring. The organization's membership consists of 59 NPN Partners, or performance presenters, drawn from twenty-seven states, including the District of Columbia. The Partners are subdivided into regions. The largest cluster of NPN Partners is found in the Southern Region (21). The Northeastern region has the second highest number of Partners (15); the Western Region has the third highest number (12), followed by the Midwestern Region, which has the least (10) (*Directory* 22).[49]

As Wegman's title of "President and C.E.O." indicates, the NPN follows a corporate model, which is key to understanding the dual nature of the organization.[50] In one sense, the NPN's continues to operate according to its founding premise—namely, to connect the distant and disparate cultural communities across the nation by touring presentation of performing artists (*Directory* 5). The founding premise represents the NPN as a random network that takes advantage of small world properties. At the same time, the NPN's programs, its position as global leader, and its top-down organizational structure reveal the NPN as a hierarchical network enterprise. In its national programming, the NPN serves as a highly clustered hub to its Partners, and Partners transform from NPN nodes to artist hubs through their own programs. Similarly, artists,

[49] My numbers differ slightly from the *Directory*, because Elia Arce resigned as an NPN Partner.

[50] The use of corporate titles is becoming more common in the nonprofit arts field. Ruby Lerner lists herself as the "Chief Executive Officer/President" of Creative-Capital, the organization I profile in my chapter on entrepreneurs. In *Corporate Networks in Europe and the United States* (2002), sociologist Paul Windolf offers two very different and broad categories of theory to explain how corporations use networks: "*functionalist theories*, explains networks by way of the economic and social functions they fulfill[;] *power or control theories*, explain how networks are instruments used to monopolize markets or to exclude potential competitors from these markets" (8). I find Windolf's rubric illuminating and comparatively simple to Castells's; however, arguing that the NPN is monopolistic is difficult. Through its programs, the NPN tries to remain anti-monopolistic, in order to support the field directly through programming and indirectly as a model. The organization does not maintain a controlling stake in the performance field, although it does have some power-based functions.

who have been presented on the NPN, enter the network and become their own lesser hubs through their familiarity with Partners and programs.

As an intermediary funding organization, the NPN secures resources from private and public funds and distributes them to the NPN Partners. NPN Partners use these combined subsidies among three programs: 1) the NPN Residency Fund, which supports artists touring outside of their communities or to a NPN Partner space within their community, 2) the Creation Fund, which commissions the "research and development" of new performance, and 3) the Community Fund, which subsidizes activities that may extend from a Residency or Creation Fund Project (*Directory* 9-14).[51] Independent artists or companies supported by the NPN have little opportunity to exceed the bounded frame of the network procedures. The Residency Program operates under a standardized fee structure considered equitable by the NPN Partners, as well as a standardized contract and standardized reporting requirements. The NPN provides 40 percent of all expenses, up to a total of $5,000 for one week or $10,000 for two weeks, to the organization presenting an artist (*Directory* 6). The Partner then provides a 60 percent match to the budgeted amount. Consequently, if a Partner is presenting a dance company for one week at a cost of $11,500, the NPN will provide a full 40 percent. If the budget goes up to $12,000, the Partner must provide the additional amount. The budget for solo artists will be considerably less, but the NPN's structure encourages artists to travel with technicians or directors. The weekly budget for each company or artist is determined according to a set fee structure. The organization or artist being presented earns an administrative fee of $1,500 per week, or $2,000 for two weeks. The monies may go to a company's personnel, or, in the case of a solo artist who books himself, to the artist.

[51] Currently, there are funds to support fifty-five partners, although the organization believes its organizational infrastructure could support up to seventy-five with adequate funding (6-7, 23). As in the case of the Community Fund, the other programs "inter-relate;" participation in one program may require use of another program and may implicate multiple NPN Partners (6).

Each artist or technician receives a $35 per diem and a fee of $500 per week—which represents a base salary level of $24,000 a year. The NPN subsidizes housing ($50 per night at 40 percent) as well as fees for fringe benefits to those companies who can prove that they pay staff salaries with benefits. In addition, there is a $250 contingency fund per week for any expenses that may come up (NPN, Contract 2005). As part of the Residency funds, artists are required to present at least two workshops in the community per week. The existence of fringe benefits for organizations that pay salaries appear to privilege companies over solo artists; however, the administrative fees that roll back to solo artists or small companies may make up the difference. Artists can receive Creation Fund support by securing two presenters, who will each contribute $2,000 to the artist's new work. Both of these presenters must be an NPN Partner who will agree to present the artist on an NPN Residency. For its own part, the NPN contributes $5,000 towards commissioning artistic projects and leverages additional funds toward future NPN Residency contracts" by requiring the NPN Partners to present the artist under an NPN Residency contract (*Directory* 7). Finally, NPN partners may apply to the Community Fund to receive up to $6,000 for "activities that expand upon a Performance Residency or Creation Fund [such as] planning, follow-up, documentation, or evaluation." Community Funds may also be used to "pay local artists or community organizations involved in Performance Residencies or Creation Funds" (14).

In many ways, the NPN Core Programs and initiatives are egalitarian, as befitting a random network of equivalently constructed nodes. The NPN membership and its Core programs were designed to bring artists together as a group, countering the individuation that happens when artists compete against each other in a vast market or across geographical regions marked by different levels of access to performance spaces and opportunities (*Directory* 5). The contract of the Residency is adaptable to the many

possible organizational models for companies and artists. The Residency Contract represents a form of economic parity among artists and technicians who work as collaborators when making performance. Likewise, the contract supports people who take administrative roles, but it does not determine the amount they are actually paid. The contract does set a standard fee structure for artists and companies, as well as a standard for how artists engage a communities through residency activities. Indeed, had BREAD been co-presented on an NPN Residency fund through the support of an organization like Women and Their Work in Austin (a longstanding NPN partner), Jaclyn might have accessed both the Residency Fund and the Community Fund to pay all those who were involved. She may have been influenced by the contract's allowances for collaborators and divided labors more broadly. She may have felt as if she had arrived as part of a group of artists, rather than one alone. In many ways, the contract and programs fulfill Barber's placement of artist's in the civic sector by mediating the market issues with the states issues and by requesting the work of artists be of value to communities. The contract also supports artists in articulated, material ways.

The organization programs have hierarchical properties, too. For many early and mid-career artists, Core Programs anoint and validate artists, effectively bringing them social, cultural, and financial capital appropriate to the NPN's network. To borrow Jaclyn's term, these programs help artists arrive by marking them as tour ready and/or worthy of commissioning funds, which are known as Creation Funds. NPN Partners generally present only one or two official Performance Residencies a year, depending upon the budget allocated by the NPN; consequently, most Partners do the bulk of their presenting outside of the NPN framework. This is the case of my own company, Jump-Start Performance Co., as well as many presenters with whom I've worked. Indeed, many of my appearances in NPN Partner spaces have been outside of the NPN contract.

At times, I earned more than I would have on a Performance Residency Agreement; at others, I earned less. For the most part I maintained a salary equivalent to that of NPN, roughly $2,000 per week, plus travel, housing, and per diem as an individual artist; however, on these contracts, I was generally asked to work with the technician onsite.

Creation Funds can be more accessible than many grant programs, but they require artists to have some access to the NPN. The Creation fund is a new work commissioning fund. An artist must secure a $2,000 commitment from two different NPN Partners who are willing to sponsor him or her. One partner takes a lead and writes a brief proposal and, if the monies are available, the NPN matches their commitment with an additional $5,000, bringing the total artist commission to $9,000. If the monies are not available to honor all requests, the NPN will grant Creation Funds to those Partners who have not received commissioning funds in recent history. The Creation Fund monies are used for the research and development of new work, but not necessarily for production expenses. The NPN requires organizations sponsoring artists on a Creation Fund to present artists on an NPN Residency contract (*Directory* 12). I am current recipient of a Commissioning Fund for *Higher Planes*, a show I will develop in the summer of 2006. Gathering the partners (Diverseworks in Houston, and Jump-Start Performance Co.) took me a year in phone calls and meetings, a time period that is just three months longer than most grant proposals. The receipt of the award helped move my performance career back into profile after my time spent in graduate studies.

The NPN membership and its Core programs were designed to bring artists together as a group, countering the individuation that happens as artists compete with each other in a vast market or across geographical regions (*Directory* 5). Many of the organization's programs have egalitarian properties. They represent equal shares of power across the network. They model equal financial commitments and equal

expectations on the part of the presenters. For this reason, some artists no longer work with the NPN. During my visit to the NPN offices in summer 2003, while the organization was planning its Annual Meeting, I was told of several companies and artists who no longer perform on the NPN because the salaries are too low (2003 Office Meeting Notes).

The NPN's Annual Meeting also represents a site of where the hierarchical and small-world properties are actively engaged.[52] The Annual Meeting moves from region to region each year, in attempt to showcase the talent of an area and to divide the Meeting Planning duties among the many Partners. Last year the Meeting was held in Miami. Next year, it will be held in Cedar Rapids, IA. All NPN Partners must send organizational representatives to the meeting to maintain their membership. The Annual Meeting is a business meeting during which NPN updates its membership on its well-being, reviews and amends its programs, collects support from its constituents in the form of funding resources or organizational assistance, and plans for the next year (*Directory* 11). During the Annual Meeting, the NPN presents nightly showcases featuring artists who live in the region of the Meeting or artists who have received Creation Funds. Additionally a group of fifty artists are invited to attend the annual meeting, in order to participate in dialogues, workshops, showcases (as performers or spectators), and to network broadly. During the Meeting, up to ten of these artists or groups may present short "ArtBursts," brief 10 minute excerpts that bring art to the business proceedings. These artists are curated by the NPN staff, who generally focus on showcasing artists who are new to the network. Any artist who is presented on an NPN contract within three years of the Annual Meeting will be invited to the Annual Meeting at the expense of

[52] The 2005 Annual Meeting was held in Miami, despite the destruction of the organization's office building during Hurricane Katrina, and the diffusion of its staff in the wake of the disaster. As M.K. Wegman pointed out, the NPN functioned as a virtual office through networking technologies, fulfilling its mission to its membership and the field (Wegman, Annual Meeting Introduction 2005).

the NPN. The final roster of artists-in-attendance is drawn from those who respond first (Zarsky Email Communication). NPN Partners, artists, guests, and staff have the opportunity to network broadly and become familiar with each other.

Since Wegman took the leadership of the NPN in early 2001, the organization has attempted to make artists more present and equal in the hierarchy of the NPN during its Annual Meetings and its development of an "Artist-Partner" role. These two initiatives emerged while I served on the board and Wegman served as Co-Board Chair, along with Loris Bradley (Bradley, Interview).[53] The outcomes of these programs have revealed the embeddedness of the organization's practices and the outer limits of its access to artists.

The artists' presence and appearance at Annual Meetings began shifting in 2001. Prior to that year, artists invited were limited to artists of the region, artists in showcases (of which some were from the region), and artists serving on the Board. At the Annual meeting of 2001, which I could not attend, the organization initiated its first "Artist Retreat," a two-day meeting for artists held before the Annual Meeting. By 2002, the "Artist Retreat" had become the "Artist Gathering" and moved to the next-to-last day of the Annual Meeting, during which time that the Partners held a day-long business meeting. The Artist Gathering consisted of a daylong workshop on the subject of buying and maintaining real estate. The subtext of the meeting was gentrification, and the oft-repeated story of rising rents moving artists out of the neighborhoods they helped to create (Jackson et al. 46). A panel consisting of a representative from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, a local real estate agent, and a banker were present. They were introduced by Carla Perlo, a longstanding NPN Partner, who told us that she had been pushed out of two neighborhoods in Washington, D.C. before her organization,

[53] June Wilson, who currently serves as the NPN's Chief Operations Officer, was also on the Board at that time.

Dance Place, bought its building. She told us that the issue of real estate was a dear one to her and that she felt that artists should own space, too. Carla presented us with information about the National Trust's Community Partner's programs, which helps provide low-income loans and tax credits to individuals restoring historic neighborhoods. The packet included information about Project Row Houses, a Trust revitalization project led by artists that took place in Houston's Third Ward, a predominantly African-American community (NPN, "Annual Meeting Notes" 2002).

My notes are scant from this meeting, but my memory is profound. I have the handouts and a few scribblings, but I cannot find my journal. Nevertheless, I want to recount the story of the meeting because the development of events made me realize the limits of the NPN and its leviathan status, which is unmatched by any artist organization. In going forward, I offer up the materiality of memory as evidence. Wherever possible, I have attempted to contextualize my comments or take my presumptions onto myself, so that I do not unfairly critique my colleagues.

The presence of the real estate agent, the banker, and the bureaucrat from HUD at the "Artist Gathering" seemed to alienate many artists. Fresh from three days of networking, the group seemed unable or unwilling to shift focus. As each presenter offered up another insight about how we might procure real estate, spectators turned to each and rolled eyes or made comments. I told arts consultant Kathie DeNobriga, who was observing the meeting on behalf of the NPN staff, that we seemed to lack a context. In truth, I was slightly defensive. The guests spoke in terminology that I did not understand. I wanted to believe that the real estate was accessible, but I could not yet.

One artist asked, "How do I get gigs? That's what I wanna know!" The comment seemed indicative of all the disbelief in the room.

During a break from the real estate discussion, performance artist Marty Pottenger tried to arrange a breakout meeting to focus on forming an independent artist guild. Pottenger is a former carpenter and labor organizer who wrote the Obie Award-winning *City Water Tunnel #3* (1996), a piece about union workers in New York (Pottenger, "Abundance"). In 2002, Pottenger was in the planning stages of *Abundance* (2003) her play based on interviews with the nation's richest one percent and its poorest one percent. She was already talking about material practices and concerns daily. At the NPN meeting, she spoke of the need for artists to have insurance, as well as work and wage standards. She said these were possibilities, if we would just organize as a guild. Pottenger's comments highlighted a practice I have frequently observed among colleagues. We are reluctant to talk about what we make. In the process of arguing our contracts, many of us individualize and compete. The presence of the NPN, or rather, our presence at the NPN, where work and wages are standardized, seemed to make discussion of payment moot, or perhaps less urgent.

Pottenger's proposal addressed unmet needs among all present. Immediately, I could sense the amount of work facing those who took up the charge of creating a guild. In effect, Pottenger was asking us to create a bureaucratic structure equivalent to the NPN. Pottenger asked us for time obligations of ten hours a month. She wanted us to get on the phones and call artists. She wanted us to gather names, to build a database, and to organize, perhaps even taking our list to a prominent foundation and obtaining funds to start a guild office. She wanted us all to take a leap of faith. She asked the whole group if anyone would volunteer 10 hours a month, and then she asked each of us individually. When she asked me if I would contribute 10 hours a month, I gave a noncommittal answer, "I'll have to see." Having started organizations and served on boards, I knew the real time involved. Having served on the board of the NPN, I could anticipate the

number of conference calls, reports, and meetings. I knew that some artists would participate fully and many would not. I knew that some artistic careers would be sacrificed or put on hold in the making of an organization for all. I knew, too, that a guild could be an opportunity. It would have an appeal to funders.

In the moment, however, I was concerned that Pottenger's notion of a guild lacked actual pre-planning. I was concerned that I would volunteer again and again only to find the initial group starting over and over. I didn't know if I could balance my guild time with graduate studies. I looked at the person who asked the real estate panel for more gigs, a Latina who makes work about Chicana feminisms, and I thought how much work it would be to bring in a group of artists to the same level of participation and understanding. Despite my concerns for all of us, I knew I was not up to the task.

Nevertheless, Pottenger's proposal has stayed with me, partly because it revealed the NPN as a network leviathan, and the leviathan as a form of hegemony to me. I remained convinced by the nature and uniqueness of the NPN's operations that an equivalent structure could not be available for artists (Flores, *Los Pastores* 163).[54] The existence of the NPN appeared appropriate as an organization of presenters, because presenters have more federal and private subsidies. As individuals who look to the intermediary funds that NPN Partners provide, the artists do not have the same level of access. When I imagined myself participating in the organization of a guild, I imagined myself becoming like the hardworking staff members and Partners who are always planning on behalf of the artists. In effect, I would become, like them, a bureaucrat.

Now I realize that in the negation of Pottenger's idea, I looked away from a radical possibility for artists and from alternative forms of fundraising and organization.

[54] "Hegemony is the process of imposition, coercion, consent, negotiation, and acquiescence in the maintenance of and resistance to particular social formations." (Flores *Los Pastores* 163)

I looked away from faith itself, and from change that could come from a willingness to support different material practices, based on openness, coordination, and untried approaches. In the greater schema, beyond my personal response and contribution, there existed the possibility of something new, whether I participated or not. By the next year at the Annual Meeting in Chicago, Pottenger was busy with *Abundance*, and the guild discussion did not come up. Over the next three years, the "Artist Gathering" morphed into the a one-day workshop focused on artist professionalization. At the 2005 meeting, the "Artist Workshop" was given by the Creative Capital Professional Development Program. I focus on that program in my chapter on entrepreneurs (NPN, "Annual Meeting Notes" 2003, 2004, 2005).

In recent years, the NPN tried to increase artist participation by opening up its membership directly to artists, specifically through the development of an "Artist-Partner" role. According to former Board Co-Chair Loris Bradley, the organization created the role as part of a greater commitment to making the NPN more accessible to artists. The organization anticipated that the Artist Partner would participate in the NPN's Core Programs. At the same time, the NPN anticipated that aritsts' presence among the Partners would catalyze more innovations (Arce and Bradley, Personal Interview).

Elia Arce applied to the organization and was named the first Artist Partner in 2001. Elia Arce is a multi-disciplinary, community-based artist who combines "performance, theater, film/video, writing and installation." She has received the J. Paul Getty Individual Artist Award, as well as grants from the Rockefeller Foundation and the National Endowment for the Arts. In twenty years, she has created and directed solo works and community-based group theater pieces. Her solo performance, "First Woman on the Moon," was featured at the Los Angeles International Theatre Festival in 2002 and

Mayo Teatral International Latino Theatre Festival in Cuba in 2003. Her Fruitvale project at La Pena in Berkeley mentored a group of new performers in activism and social justice (*Directory* 30). As an artist who has successfully raised upwards of $200,000 for her own projects, Arce seemed the most suitable choice for the Artist-Partner role. In her community of Joshua Tree, she held weekly poetry and performance nights at a café called the Crossroads Tavern, for artists from the area around Joshua Tree (Arce, Telephone Interview).

Upon becoming a Partner, Arce recognized that the role was defined by the NPN's own network functions. The NPN staff and board maintained the same standards and practices for all Partners. Arce was asked to present other artists through Core Programs. She could not use Creation Funds to present her own work, even as a collaborator, nor could she repeatedly present herself. Consequently, she was in the position of raising money to support others in addition to herself. At first, she was required to attend the annual meeting at her own expense, like other partners (Personal Interview). I asked Arce if the organization's expectations had been made clear to her, and she said she thought she could work around them or adapt them (Telephone Interview). The conflict between Arce and the NPN reveal the different network approaches taken between artists and the organization. Arce anticipated working in a network that could be easily redefined, while the organization maintained its hierarchal, bounded network structure. Both sides of the conflict maintained their essential definition, even as they continued to work together.

For each of the NPN's requests and expectations Arce asked for and was given an exception. After her first year, she asked the organization to excuse her from presenting duties and to help her with travel to the Annual Meeting. In the following year, she asked again. That same year, Arce was asked to serve on the NPN Board as an Artist

Representative. Rather than drawing from its greater network of artists, the organization drew from within its own elite. Arce was told that her task was to help the organization figure out her role (Telephone Interview)

Arce saw her task differently: "I realized that there weren't a significant number of Latino/a organizations on the NPN; when I was invited to perform for Latino/a audiences, I was going to spaces not on the network" (Telephone Interview). The Centro Cultural de Aztlan, a prominent Chicano/a cultural arts center in San Diego and longtime NPN Partner had recently folded. Arce decided to increase Latino/a partnership within the organization. She recruited GALA Hispanic Theater, an LGBT theatrical presenter from D.C. She recruited MACLA/Movimiento de Arte y Cultural Latino Americana from San Jose, CA and Xicanidio, from Mesa, AZ, two multidisciplinary arts organizations (Telephone Interview). Through these accomplishments, Arce essentially reinforced the NPN's structure, but changed its complexion.

During her tenure as an NPN Artist Partner, she applied to only one Core Program, the Community Fund. In 2003, Arce invited three performers from L.A.—Danielle Brazelle, Marcus Kuiland-Nazario, and James Luna—to appear on a program with Linda Sibio, a resident of Joshua Tree who had once been part of the L.A.P.D. performance group. Arce's intent was to cultivate interest in performance and touring among the poets who appeared at her weekly readings and to take the Joshua Tree residents back to L.A. to appear at Highways, the Performance Space in Santa Monica where Brazelle served as Artistic Director.

Following the event, Sibio, who is schizophrenic, gathered other performers and launched a small performance collective called "Half Baked," but Arce abandoned the exchange to go on to other projects. In 2004, Arce received a co-commissioning subsidy from Diverseworks in Houston and Jump-Start to produce *The Fifth Commandment*, a

work interrogating soldiers' experiences of death and killing in previous wars and especially the Iraq war. The work was inspired by some veterans who appeared in her weekly poetry readings. The show opened in November, 2004 at the Yerba Buena Center in San Francisco before coming to San Antonio and Houston in June of 2005 (Personal Interview). In fall 2005, she began graduate studies in the Department of Art at the University of Houston. In addition to receiving an MFA, she hopes to help the university develop a multi-disciplinary program. In March 2006, she resigned as Artist-Partner (Telephone Interview).

In response to her resignation, Arce said: "I felt the only way I could stay on as an Artist Partner was to form a nonprofit. I believe that artists need a parallel [network] organization, but the staff is overworked. They don't have the resources to make it happen." Arce added that the parallel structure would require funds and staff to help manage the artists (Personal Interview). I asked Arce to explain the parallel organization, and she described it as "maybe 15 Artist-Partners among 50 NPN partners" (Telephone Interview). Up until that point, I had believed that the parallel structure she imagination was more akin to Pottenger's notion of a guild, a network organization that systematically addressed artists' material practices.

The NPN's programs and history reveal the organization to be a bounded, hierarchical network. Through programming the NPN has attempted to open a space for artists in its hierarchy, both through its board representation and its creation of the Artist-Partner role. Ultimately, however, the organization has remained faithful to its mission as a network of artist presenters. Although Arce imagined a similar structure of networking for artists, she repeatedly stated that the NPN was at capacity and that it could not really manage its current membership (Telephone Interview). The appearances of artists at the meetings have served to remind artists of the limits of the NPN's definition

and a need for a network structure that interacts with the organizational level of the NPN. As I point out in my next chapter, the cultural sector has a history of replicating its operational structures. Network properties like small-world connections, hierarchical organization, and scale-free proportions can help artists and arts organizers map old and new forms of operation. Consequently, artists and arts organizers alike must be able to read network structures to put them to effective or progressive use in cultural practices.

Pryor's approach to BREAD offers another picture of networks, but it is a picture that informs the NPN structure. The networks created by BREAD were unbounded. As they grew, they provided new levels of access and a multiplicity of challenges to the individual in charge. Jaclyn's role as a hub and the demands it presented suggested that the role might have been better shared among a number of hubs, all of whom could have been recognized and honored as participants. The demands were a call to collaboration between the creator and BREAD's many supporters. The need for resource-sharing extended from the original proposal and requested amount to the post-production follow-up in consideration of a future iteration of both BREAD and First Night Austin.

Jaclyn's participation as the main hub of BREAD offers, in hindsight and analysis, the means to consider the actual costs, with respect to labor and finances, of such a project. A network analysis of BREAD also reveals a clear picture of its value, as the many participatory nodes and smaller hubs are revealed for their contributions and costs.

The appearance of unbounded networks in the making of an original production also begs the question whether networks become bounded in repetition or reapplication. Wasn't the NPN once a universe of possibilities tamed by the mission and resources available? If so, then the "production" metaphor serves as a potent model for the actual costs and potentials for an artist guild or organization comparable to the NPN. On a

smaller scale, a network-oriented analysis may provide a clear picture of any initiative or project looming before the artist and help determine what connections and shared resources might benefit her career in the moment and in the future.

I would encourage any independent artist who encounters the word "networking" or "networks" to consider the following questions. Is the network in question a bounded system, or an unbounded one? If it is bounded, then it is more likely a formed organization or production. If it is bounded, is it hierarchical? If it is hierarchical what levels of access are available to artists, and where does the artist stand in the relation to the network as a whole? What is the individual's potential benefit of participating in the network, and what are the possible setbacks?

If it is unbounded, or a network of an individual's creation, what are the potential costs of constructing the network? How might labor and access be mapped? What clues does such a network map offer to the resources needed, the ways in which labor may be shared and honored? How does the map contribute to a statement of value? How ultimately does the network reveal the community involving in the making of performance?

Chapter Three: "Invoking Need"

"Artists have also helped us interpret our past, define the present, and imagine the future. In spite of these significant contributions, there's been an inadequate set of support structures to help artists, especially younger, more marginal or controversial ones, to realize their best work. Many artists have struggled and continue to struggle to make ends meet. They often lack adequate resources for health coverage, housing, and for space to make their work"

—Maria-Rosario Jackson, et al. (*Investing in Creativity*, 2002).

"Artists, musicians, professors and scientists have always set their own hours, dressed in relaxed and casual clothes and worked in stimulating environments. They could never be forced to work, yet they were never truly not at work. With the rise of the Creative Class, this way of working has moved from the margins to the economic mainstream."

—Richard Florida (*The Rise of the Creative Class*, 2002).

"If we really want artists to make art, then let's relieve them of the burdens of overhauling a weak infrastructure."

—Ann Daly ("Beyond Richard Florida: A Cultural Sector of Our Own," 2005).

"It's that language, 'not-for-profit.' It's like welfare. It's diminishing. It always makes you think about yourself in a somewhat minimal way. And in order to be prosperous, you have to make a decision at some point that you deserve [prosperity]."

— Laurie Carlos (Personal Interview, 2005).

In recent years the word "need" has proven a hot button among cultural policy practitioners, leading to a debate between value-based models of arts patronage, which promote the arts on the basis of what they bring to society, and expressive-based models of cultural policy, which promote the inherent value of arts. I believe the debates indicate the importance for a greater understanding of need's presence, history, and function in the cultural sector.

In this chapter, I examine how a discourse of "need" affects the lives of independent performing artists. To historicize this discourse, I offer a brief history of public patronage in the United States. In the last century alone, the arts industries have witnessed massive social and economic developments, led by the rise of nonprofits

among the "lively arts" and the "fine arts," in fields once dominated broadly by enterprise, the rise of technologies disseminating the arts to the masses, and the subsequent distinction between the high arts and low arts (Kreidler, *Leverage* 150-157). Following a practice established by a few prominent philanthropists, a state-based model of cultural patronage favoring the nonprofit arts organization has emerged, peaked, and receded. In its wake, a broad, diverse, and, some would argue, "fragmented" culturally-vested nonprofit community has become aware of its vulnerability with respect to social and financial capital (Wyszomirski, "Policy Community" 100-103; Cumming and Katz 11).

The independent performing artists that I examine work largely in nonprofit venues and receive funding assistance from nonprofit organizations.[55] Since the mid-1990s, most federal and private foundation support given to independent artists has been channeled through intermediary nonprofit funding organizations, such as the National Performance Network, the National Association of Latino Arts and Culture, and Creative Capital Foundation. These organizations served as "cultural brokers" between patrons and artists, offering project support, technical assistance, and other types of awards. They were designed to support artists' careers in part, with the remainder coming through multiple markets and jobs. Intermediary organizations which balance the demands of funders and artists are often overextended (Jackson et al. 28). Furthermore, the support of intermediaries has yet to produce comprehensive "employment advantages and

[55] As I learned when I optioned a show for Off-Broadway, independent theater artists who have a "commercial production" produced in Off-Broadway or Broadway theaters, or in the nation's regional LORT theaters, are eligible for union representation, or Actors' Equity. If the artist is a writer-performer, s/he may join Equity or receive a waiver to perform in the Equity-affiliated theater without joining. Choosing union affiliation has its own disincentives, since union requirements may limit where and how the performer may appear in subsequent tours. For the majority of our sector, performers work non-union circumstances, among the nonprofit theaters, halls, and dance/music/performance spaces across the country. The website for Actors' Equity provides extensive information about the expectations of membership (Actors' Equity).

benefits to a large number of artists" like a union or guild. Their partial support leaves a space of need to be filled (66-69).

By combining three significant and related historical progressions in the cultural landscape of the U.S.—the shift from for-profit to non-profit arts, the rise and decline of the patron state, and the birth of the field of cultural economics—I show how a series of cultural initiatives informed by capital have contributed to a discourse of need. Within the current climate, the discourse has often been used as a political rhetoric both for and against artists.

Need is the implicit and guiding theme in *Investing in Creativity*, a 2002 document published by the Urban Institute that seeks to locate, study, theorize, and support the lives of artists in the U.S. today (Jackson et al. 1-3). The *Investing* document directly fostered Leveraging Investments in Creativity (LINC), an organization committed to realizing the findings of the study. The call of the document and the response of the LINC organization provide an excellent example of needs-based cultural policy, with respect to its opportunities and its challenges.

In this chapter, I follow the call and response of the document and organization with a conversation between two artists, Renita Martin and Laurie Carlos, who speak of need in their own lives and in the lives of their colleagues. Although they do not address *Investing in Creativity* specifically, their words occupy the same discursive terrain. Martin and Carlos are recent collaborators who have very different experiences of need, and ambivalence to the word itself. At times, they embody the discourse; at times, they challenge it. Their ambivalence echoes my own, and I find their responses surprising and thought-provoking.

NEED DEFINED

The word "need" is defined in the *Oxford English Dictionary* as a "necessity [or] requirement." Need becomes manifest in a "violence, force, constraint, or compulsion, exercised by or upon a person." One's needs could be characterized as "of or by necessity; unavoidably, compulsorily." Need is the "necessity for a particular action or course of action arising from the facts or circumstances of a situation."

Need is neither passive nor latent. Already engaged in making its presence known, it quickly becomes demanding. The verb forms of the word confirm this. To need is 1) "to exercise constraint or compulsion upon; to harass or trouble (a person), 2) to constrain, compel, or force to a thing, or 3) to require or constrain (a person) to do something." Thus, a needy person is "poor, destitute, without necessaries [including] spiritual and emotional needs."

The needing citizen, much like the needy one, holds a tenuous place in the society of the United States. Benjamin Barber finds the tension in a dialectic involving work and value. To paraphrase, the nation has come to value work at the same time that national work opportunities are declining. Seen as someone unwilling to work rather than someone who cannot find adequate work, the underemployed citizen in need remains an object of scorn. Similarly, the cultural theorist Lauren Berlant locates this tension in an ideological image born during the Reagan era, when the "American Dream" came to include a very narrow notion of citizenship:

> In the new nostalgia-based fantasy nation of the "American way of life," the residential enclave where "the family" lives usurps the modernist promise of the culturally vital, multi-ethnic city; in the new utopian America, mass-mediated political identifications can only be rooted in

> traditional notions of home, family, and community. Meanwhile, the notion of a public life, from the profession of politician to non-family based-forms of political activism, has been made to seem ridiculous and even dangerous to the nation. (5)

Unlike Barber, who finds the tension in labor, Berlant sources the conflict in nostalgic images of "home, family, and community" that deny the complex economic and social inequalities of race, class, culture, gender, and sexuality. Berlant uses the term "intimate public sphere" to describe the public space where identities that conform to nostalgic images of home, family, and patriotism are legitimized. In the intimate public sphere those who cannot adhere to narrowly defined "family values" and realize the "American Dream" are regarded with contempt (4-5).

Perhaps in recognition of the disdain reserved for those perceived as abject, the cultural policy sector has tried to play bait and switch with the image and the realities of artist need through a variety of arguments about the value of the arts. The argument appears in different guises. Richard Florida, in perhaps the most notable iteration, has argued that artists constitute part of a creative class that brings value to cities through their activities in arts districts and coffee shops. Cities need the arts, says Florida. The arts and artists contribute extensively to the vitality, creativity, and attractiveness of a city to the nation's corporations. The social and cultural capital they bring to a city has a material affect. Florida's work has been echoed by a number of studies meant to advocate for the instrumental value of the arts to local economy.[56] And communities regularly tout the arts as an indicator of quality of life (Garten 26).

---

[56] See also Elizabeth Strom's *Strengthening Communities Through Culture* (2001), Joni M. Cherbo and Margaret J. Wyzomirski's *The Public Life of Arts in America* (2000), and "Arts and Economic Prosperity" (2002), published by Americans for the Arts.

In "Expressive Logic: A New Premise in Arts Advocacy" (2003), communications scholar Joli Jensen states that arguments based on the societal benefits of arts "lack empirical evidence [and that] the instrumental perspective fosters self-serving and rhetorically unpersuasive arguments" (65). Jensen's notion of "expressive logic," recognizes arts as inherently valuable to society. Expressive logic does not require arts to offer up economic and social benefits; in other words, it does not marry arts arguments to discernable forms of social, financial, and cultural capital (66). Jensen claims that expressive logic comes from Alexis de Tocqueville's *Democracy in America* (1830) and John Dewey's *Art as Experience* (1930), two books that presumed art had strong democratic value.[57] Jensen notes that the attackers of the NEA positioned art as "elitist" and removed from the broader public (67). Like Barber, Jensen promotes value as a means to change. Unlike Barber, she locates obstacles to change in arts supporters. Jensen writes that arts supporters are too accustomed to the many systems of support available and that arts supporters disdain popularity and commercial success. Jensen believes that artists who are convinced of their own expressive value would take a variety of approaches to support their work (72). Her arguments are echoed by former NEA Chair Bill Ivey, who believes that the U.S. cultural sector needs to erase distinctions between commercial and non-commercial forms of art and to embrace innovative forms of support. Only then can artists get past notions of "need" (Ivey, "America").

Instrumental approaches and expressive approaches address the ways that artists benefit a community with respect to financial capital (instrumental) and social, cultural, and intellectual capital (expressive, mostly). Their arguments address the flow of capital back to spectators and patrons in return for gifts. However, these arguments do not

[57] See also *Gifts of the Muse: Reframing the Debate About the Benefits of the Arts* (McCarthy et al., 2004) and "Is there a Better Case to be Made for the Arts?" a weblog discussion (Cameron et al., 2005). Interestingly, *The Gift of the Muse* responds to an earlier work which took an opposite stance, Dick Netzer's *The Subsidized Muse: Public Support for the Arts in the United States* (1978).

address the ways in which communities, corporations, and individuals demand these flows or the many ways they received benefits. A more holistic picture would express the mutuality of "need" shared among artists, patrons, and communities. A more holistic view includes both expressive and instrumental arguments, as well as a historical account of patronage. To contribute to expressive and instrumental arguments, I offer an account of how discourses of need based on patronage practices have taken root in the public's imagination. The history of the last century reveals a very clear picture of need functioning as the text and subtext of the cultural sector through the programs of patronage purported to sustain artists and arts organizations. However, the history of patronage in the United States reveals a clear picture of interdependence between benefactors and recipients, a mutual "need" shared between parties that was mostly attributed to "artists in need."

THE DISCOURSE OF NEED AND THE PATRON STATE

For a variety of reasons, artists and patrons have always needed each other; the contemporary tenor of this need is based on a process begun a century ago. In the first half of the twentieth century, the lively arts were largely a for-profit business: vaudeville, burlesque, spectacle reviews such as the Ziegfeld Follies, and the light opera were moneymaking enterprises (Kislan 41-110). The development of film and television winnowed audiences from for-profit theatrical enterprises. At the same time, a changing tax code made the support of not-for-profit arts organizations an attractive option for philanthropists to support artists through the nonprofit sector. For many theatrical organizations, the transformation from for-profit to not-for-profit emerged from

conditions that appealed to both arts producers and consumers (DiMaggio, "Social" 38-52).[58]

Nonprofit, or not-for-profit, arts organizations function according to a for-profit corporate model with a governing board of directors, but nonprofits engage in different practices that include, but are not limited to, income guidelines, limited tax liabilities, and receptivity to charitable donations (Godfrey, "Policy and Philanthropy"). Not-for-profit corporations were chartered into the original United States constitution. These associations are modeled on the British Statute of Charitable Uses of 1601, which was implemented under the reign of Elizabeth I. The Statute elaborated on the value of organizations that served the greater civic purpose as well as people in need, including "the aged, impotent and poor people." It charged citizens to organize such associations and to be accountable to each other through them (Hammack 5-8). The British Statute descended from Roman law, "which categorized corporations as civil, ecclesiastical, law, or eleemosynary." The eleemosynary organization was "the forerunner of today's non-profit corporation" (Nicholas 1). Although every revenue act has included a provision for charitable, religious, and educational groups to receive [tax] exemption since 1894, Congress did not actually create the 501 (c) (3) tax-exempt designation of the Internal Revenue Code until 1913 (Jeffri 31-33).

In 1950, Congress articulated the income tax code for nonprofit corporations. Under Subchapter F, Congress left a number of provisions up to the states (Nicholas 1-2). Under federal law, not-for-profits can take advantage of reduced postal rates; they can accept donations, gifts, and grants from benefactors who may then claim the gifts as tax deductions. Depending upon their location, nonprofits can take advantage of state and local income tax laws, and local sales and property tax exemptions. By 1950, a two-step

[58] See also Lawrence Levine's *Highbrow Lowbrow: The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America* (1998).

process for obtaining not-for-profit status was put into place, namely not-for-profit incorporation by the state followed by a federal tax exemption as determined by the Internal Revenue Service (Jeffri 31-32).[59]

Independent artists encounter the nonprofit sectors in various ways. By establishing their own nonprofits, they enter the ecology of the nonprofit sector directly. By performing in nonprofit theaters, they work in an environment that has been directly affected by the growth of the nonprofit sector and the financial hardships faced by it. Finally, by applying to a number of granting organizations they participate in the practices and outcomes of the nonprofit environment.

Not-for-profit and "tax-exempt" statuses are not one and the same. Nonprofit organizations must apply to the IRS for the tax status and follow its prescriptive guidelines. Furthermore, incorporated nonprofits must adhere to a number of record-keeping regulations established by the government (Nicholas 1-2). According to the tax code, these organizations must "be organized for 'religious, charitable, scientific, [. . .] literary, or educational purposes that are not organized for private benefit, and do not participate in or try to influence legislation or political candidates" (qtd. in Jeffri 32). Until it has received a letter from the IRS conferring its 501 (c) (3) tax-exempt designation, an incorporated nonprofit organization is actually a private foundation (32 n. 46). [60]

All donors to tax-exempt not-for-profit organizations may deduct some amounts of their contributions from their federal income taxes. Private foundations, which

---

[59] "The two basic types of tax-exempt organizations under the Internal Revenue Code section 501 include a) a wide range of not-for-profit organizations including labor groups, credit unions, business leagues, teachers' retirement fund associations, and chambers of commerce and b) under section 501 (c) (3), not-for-profit corporations, or organizations that are operated for 'religious, charitable, scientific, . . . literary, or educational purposes'" (qtd. in Jeffri 32). Contributions 501 (c) (3) organizations are tax-exempt, but contributions, or memberships, to the former are not (32).

[60] Private foundations are subject to "heavy excise and other taxes." They defer taxes by making large gifts to nonprofits with tax-exempt status (31).

contribute earnings from investments and assets, may deduct the full amount. Corporations may "deduct up to 10 percent of [their] taxable income." Private donors "may deduct up to 50 percent of their contribution base (contribution base is usually the same as one's adjusted gross income) for contributions to 501 (c) (3) organizations that are not private foundations" (Jeffri 32-33). The corporate model applied to nonprofits produces an image of conditions that are equal to for-profit corporations and beneficial to nonprofit organizations with tax-exempt designations (Silber 16). It is important to note, however, that nonprofits have always depended as much on earned income as they have on charitable donations. By and large, American nonprofit arts organizations earn half of their income from sales revenues (Kreidler, "Leverage" 150).[61]

Patronage benefits recipients and donors alike. In the arts and culture industries of the United States, patrons are supply-side participants who anticipate the demand of audiences (Balfe, "Introduction" 2-3). Broadly, the patron model emerges from two distinct influences, one "elitist" and aristocratic, which sees art as a means of glorifying the (monarchic) state, the other "populist" and "egalitarian," which sees art as the "social glue" (Balfe, "Conclusion" 309-310). Although the patronage model emerged from elites familiar with European state models, it quickly took on the egalitarian qualities in accordance with the needs of the United States democracy (DiMaggio, "Social" 40).

The origins of patronage point to the mixture of financial, social, and cultural capital attendant to the processes of support, as well as the ethos of the patrons themselves. In the early period after World War I, a number of philanthropists including John D. Rockefeller, Pierre Samuel du Pont, and J.P. Morgan engaged in philanthropy for reasons of socially responsible ethos as well as their desire to burnish their status and deflect the derision of being labeled "robber barons." The rise of the publicly-traded

[61] See also *Who Pays for the Arts? The International Search for Models of Arts Support* (1989) by Milton C. Cummings, Jr. and J. Mark Davidson Schuster, eds.

company after the War encouraged the growth of a "bureaucratic system for arts supports." Corporations and the wealthy began to contribute to charitable causes to please stockholders, who wanted to see the nation's culture benefiting from its wealth. In turn, wealthy patrons demanded a quid pro quo from the government (Kirchberg 363). The return on their investment came through tax-exempt, charitable institutions, which brought social, cultural, and financial capital back to the patrons. U.S. nonprofits provide multiple benefits to corporations, foundations, and individuals who subsidize them: benefits such as prestige, tax shelters, and in some cases, the works themselves (Moore 25-41; Baumol and Bowen, "Arguments" 42-57). Today, donor recognition is often meted out in the public sphere through above-line crediting, theater program credits, or special donor access to elite events. The amount of credit is congruent not only with the amount given, but also the perceived value of the patronage which has been heavily promoted to the general public (Balfe, "Introduction" 1-7). If an individual or foundation gives enough to endow the wing of a museum, a library, or a theater, she, he, or it gains recognition and value. The SBC (Southwestern Bell) Center sports arena in San Antonio, the Bass Performance Hall on the University of Texas at Austin campus (which is named after a prominent Texas family with vast oil stakes), and the multiple Carnegie Libraries are but a few examples. [62]

In the early part of the century, the philanthropist Andrew Carnegie initiated an arts and culture granting program through his foundation. In "Leverage Lost: Evolution in the Nonprofit Arts System," (1996) historian John Kreidler writes that between 1950

---

[62] See Ron Chernow's *Titan: The Life of John D. Rockefeller* (1998), Jean Strouse's *Morgan, An American Financier* (2000), and Volker Kirchner's "Structures of Corporate Arts Patronage between the World Wars: A Case Study of the Corporate Leader P.S. du Pont" (2004), which I cite in this section. In my research, I have found examples of citizens as unwitting patrons through the tax system, such as *Patrons Despite Themselves: Taxpayers and Arts Policy* by Alan Feld, Michael O'Hare, and J. Mark Davidson Shuster. Similarly, David Throsby discusses the aggregate value of the arts to artists and spectators alike in *Economics and Culture*.

and 1990, the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundations developed and popularized the matching-grant model that is used today. Much of the credit for the matching grant model is given to W. MacNeil Lowry, a vice-president of the Ford Foundation from 1957-1976. Like their Carnegie predecessors, Ford Foundation grants were not gifts, but short-term challenge monies meant to leverage other donors and to stimulate artistic enterprise in a manner similar to any for-profit start-up. The terms of the awards varied from two to five years. Recipients were required to secure matching donations of two-to-four dollars for every dollar received. Through the matching grant, the Ford foundation established a patron model that is unique to the United States (150-152). Between 1950 and 1990, many arts organizations that had once functioned as proprietorships changed to nonprofit organizations to take advantage of private patronage (152). The high growth of the nonprofit sector was matched by a decline in the commercial arts sector in every city in the United States (154)

According to Kreidler, during the Ford Era patrons gave out of civic duty, a love for arts, and a desire to see sound business principles implemented. The Ford Foundation brought a strategy to the cultural sector. Ford wanted to catalyze individuals, corporations, and foundations, as well as governmental organizations, to give to the arts and other charities. By the end of the Ford era, total foundation giving surpassed $1 billion per year, which Kreidler notes is "more than three times the amount spent by state and national governmental arts agencies, and about equal to total national, and local expenditures in the arts" (153).

Private patronage supported donors as well. The Ford era also coincided with the institutionalization of a tax structure that supported foundation giving. As Joan Jeffri writes in *Arts Money*, foundations could deduct the full amount of "the give." Individuals could donate only part (31-33). Arts patronage was a way to divert taxes to the recipients

of choice. Corporate giving became robust by the 1980s, led by "Exxon, Dayton Hudson, Philip Morris, and AT&T." Whereas foundations gave out of civic duty, corporations gave to advance their "marketing agendas" and used the arts to raise their profile as civically engaged (Kreidler, "Leverage" 153).

Foundations also played a key role in establishing the state arts council system, a loose network of state-supported organizations that exist to this day. These state organizations continue to serve as bureaucratic cultural hubs and funding intermediaries. Almost all of them continue to use the matching grant model. Their introduction during the Ford Era accompanied a greater bureaucracy in the nation's landscape (Hewett, "American Booty").

Need from the State

At various times, the nation has supported artists because it needed them. During the Great Depression, under the imprimatur of President Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal Program, the United States implemented the federally-funded Works Progress Administration (WPA). Under the WPA, artists worked on large-scale arts projects, from murals to federally funded plays, meant to support cultural life in the United States (Dubin 669). The WPA was divided among disciplines, such as the Federal Arts Project, which oversaw the visual arts, and the Federal Theater Project (Weisberger 43; Witham 1-2). According to historian Dolores Kearns Goodwin, the WPA affected the lives of "tens of thousands of artists" who served the nation. The nation benefited in return:

> [T]he WPA programs did far more than feed hungry artists [. . .]. Touring repertory groups performed both works of Shakespeare and new works by the masses, producing plays that are still considered among the finest in

> the history of American theater [. . .]. By making artistic endeavors accessible to the many, they were no longer regarded as luxuries for the rich, but as something everyone needed to enrich their daily lives, to uplift their spirits, to stimulate their creative energies. (Lecture).

Goodwin's comment points to the erasure of lines between high art and low art during this period, and to a greater civic role that artists would play in times of national crisis for the next thirty years (Kreidler, "Leverage" 150-152).

The utopian cast of Goodwin's characterization is complicated by the fact that the government used artistic support to advance its own needs. In "The Social Origins of the Federal Art Project" (1985), historian Helen Townsend writes that in the 1930s the arts "were seen as a vehicle for teaching ideology" about the value of the free market at a time when the free market was ailing (264-265). Artists were recognized as potential leaders whose works could be directed in service of the democratic state (282). Artists were needed to bolster the nation's support of artists against the rising fascist movements in Europe (Dubin 671). By using artists to teach ideology, the United States mirrored the efforts of socialists who put cultural production in service of revolution (Jensen 71). Programs such as the WPA, the Federal Arts Project, and the Federal Theater Project, combined salaried artistic support through with ever-increasing social controls (Dubin 672).[63]

The National Play Advisory Board served as the oversight for the Federal Theater Project. The board determined which plays were acceptable and which merited production. Its purview extended to works already in production. Sociologist Steven Dubin writes, "If leakages were discovered in the system—if local officials or

[63] See *A People's History of the United States*, Howard Zinn for more about the socialist tensions that haunted the founding of the PWAP and the WPA (320-405).

community groups had a strong negative reaction against a play, for example—production could be halted" (674). Dubin notes that the government suspended plays that were considered a threat to national security. The plays included Marc Blitzstein's *The Cradle Will Rock*, which was considered "potentially inciteful of disruptive action by dramatizing labor unrest during a period of similar potential difficulties," and Meyer Levin's *Model Tenement*, which critiqued the government's failure to better social assistance to "the needy" (Witham 1, 84).

In 1938, the year leading up to the United States' entry into the War, the bill to make federal arts programs permanent was shot down in Congress. Rep. Martin Dies led the House Un-American Activities investigation of the WPA, "hoping to brand the whole Roosevelt Administration as communist-tinged." By 1939, the WPA was discontinued. The FAP was shifted to the War department, where visual artists were put to work making "posters, models, and camouflage kits," before being finally closed down in 1943 (Weisberger 20-21).

By the mid-1960s the state needed artists again. In 1965 President Lyndon B. Johnson signed into law the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). The organizations were created to institutionalize the cultural aspects of a great civilization during the Cold War, to shore up the support of east coast liberals, and to promote the development of Johnson's Great Society, the name given to his comprehensive social programs. The NEA was also created to support the development of the individual artists across the nation. Artistic development served the politics of the time (Brenson 1-2).

As historian Daniel Belgrad notes, the newly minted NEA encountered a structure of feeling in the nation that supported the existence of an arts bureaucracy but denied artists actual control. A Cold War xenophobia and a pride in American capitalist

prosperity had ruled the nation since the McCarthy Era of the 1950s, when Republican Senator Joseph McCarthy began looking for communists among government employees as well as artists. During this time, the "technological control" that marked the Ford assembly-line era was replaced by a new form of "bureaucratic control" in the liberal-minded corporate environment. Companies "instituted a system of homogenization that rewarded rule-following and attitude management as good in themselves, requiring these qualities as the first step in a promotion" (Belgrad 2-4). Individuals ascribing to the culture of spontaneity believed that creativity was a sign of American genius (247-248). Artists were considered too spontaneous, irrational, and incapable of supporting themselves. Accordingly, artists were not consulted on the founding of the NEA (Brenson 3-7).[64]

In 1966, William J. Baumol and William G. Bowen published *Performing Arts: The Economic Dilemma*, a text that is now considered foundational to the field of cultural economics (Heilbrun and Gray 6). In *Performing Arts*, Baumol and Bowen introduce the theory of "cost disease," which explains that as arts organizations grow, their cost exceeds their capacity for earned income, which leads to a "market failure." Baumol and Bowen argue that organizations susceptible to market failure deserve governmental support and intervention (369).

Performing Arts: The Economic Dilemma set a precedent for needs-based analyses and the implementation of cultural policies to support organizations. Arts organizations were cast in the same irrational light with respect to business acumen (Frey 3-6).[65] Cultural economics emerged in the field of neoclassical economics, which uses a

[64] In her dissertation *American Arts Policy and the National Endowment for the Arts in the 1990s*, Jiyoun Choi also examines how the NEA's founding coincides with Baumol and Bowen's book (12-13).

[65] Baumol and Bowen are credited with founding contemporary cultural economics, however, sociologist and futurist Alvin Toffler made similar claims in *The Culture of Consumers* (1964), a book that preceded *Performing Arts* by two years. In *The Culture of Consumers*, Toffler refers to "cost disease" as "The Law of Inefficiency in Art." The Law states that "the need for subsidy will probably rise sharply in they

clear behavioral model presuming common sense decisions as the basis for most decisions related to supply and demand (6). Cultural economics offers a standard of rationality that is almost paradoxical in it description of artists. Caves notes that demand is uncertain in the arts (2). Also, since "time is of the essence," the popularity of a work may be fleeting, or not occur within the artist's lifetime (8). Artists enter into the field despite great risk. Abbing contends that many artists presume they will do exceptionally well, despite the likelihood to the contrary (38). Likewise, artists continue to support their work, largely through "discounted labor," in the hopes of an eventual financial payoff, and out of a desire to realize a vision, or to garner acclaim among colleagues (Kreidler "Leverage" 151).

The Needs of Artists

Between the founding of the NEA and the founding of the field of cultural economics in the United States, a greater discourse of artist need emerged. The bureaucratic control that functioned throughout corporate America served as the "habitus" in which the patron state and economic analyses converged. Pierre Bourdieu's notion of habitus describes the everyday quality embedded and accepted in social functions through habitual practice (*Distinction*). The cultural sector was marked by paradox. Artists were associated with the unplanned and the needing, despite the fact that they would contribute substantially to the growth of the NEA over the next quarter century.

Within a few short years of the founding of the NEA, artists assumed a paradoxical position with the nation. Artistically, many inhabited an ideological

---

aggregate as the years go by, rather than diminish" (167). I have given credit to Baumol and Bowen because their book is identified with the founding of cultural economics, which have contributed more extensively to the literatures of cultural policy that I examine.

counterstance, criticizing the nation's involvement in the Vietnam War and establishing strong counterculture movements (Belgrad 247, 255-56). Between the 1960s and the 1990s, state-based arts patronage grew vast as new models emerged and organizations and artists alike acclimated to these resources. Unlike the WPA, these programs provided technical assistance training to artists in free enterprise and organizational work. From the late 1970s to the early 1980s, the U.S. government administered the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA), a federally funded, locally administered program that paid salaries for individuals working in organizations in managerial support positions (Dubin 670). Although not created to support artists specifically, CETA provided many independent artists with their first exposure to working within firms and supported the establishment of many additional arts organizations (Jackson et al. 33).

In 1972, the NEA instituted the Endowment's Workshop Program, which supported artists who transformed abandoned, non-commercial, urban spaces into active cultural centers. The Workshop guidelines actively promoted "artist self-determination" and the renewal of downtown neighborhoods. In "Rhetorical Questions: The Alternative Arts Sector and the Imaginary Public" (1993), art historian Grant Kester notes that although the program was designed to attract and create an alternative arts sector, it actually drew in the white-middle class and educated individuals. These artists aspired to a bohemian lifestyle, but had the skill sets and access to function within the nation's bureaucratic programs:

> Taking up a position of an artist in our society has a great deal to do with acculturation and access. Thus, one chooses to become an artist as a result of several related factors: having even the limited leisure time to pursue art, having access to various forms of art education—often graduate level

> training—and coming from a social background that makes the idea of becoming an artist at least thinkable. (117)

Through the participation of these elites, an "artist space movement" took force. Artists put down roots, created "well-funded arts venues" that exist today, including Franklin Furnace and the Kitchen in New York City, the Washington Project for the Arts ("WPA"), NAME Gallery in Chicago, and the Southeastern Center for Contemporary Arts in Winston-Salem. Under NEA leadership, many artists transformed themselves into "artists/administrators, or in less flattering terms artists/bureaucrats." They established their own support organizations, such as the National Association of Arts Organizations (NAAO), and the National Alliance of Media Arts Centers (NAMAC). They adapted their own rhetorical tools to advance their causes and careers (Kester 111-112). In doing so, they worked as "artist-producers" in the greater realm of the field, leaving behind their artist practice to support these opportune initiatives. Kester argues that artists were self-determined subjects who oscillated rhetorically, presenting themselves as "working class" and "cultural worker[s]" when it benefited their further growth. Such rhetorics fulfilled the Endowment's original conception of an artist as ennobled and in need of bureaucratic support, even as it belied the very organized hands and labors of artists (117-119).

By the early 1990s, the NEA maintained 23 individual fellowship and grant categories, 8 new commission or project categories to individuals working through organizational intermediaries, 10 artist residency fellowships, and 19 subgrant programs that reached individuals through other organizations (Ziegler 152). These programs were in addition to the Endowments programs for cultural organizations and education programs. In 1990, Senator Jesse Helm (R-NC), Representative Dana Rohrabacher (R-CA), Patrick Buchanan, and Rev. Donald Wildmon led an attack on the NEA, arguing

that the work funded by the endowment offended the religious, political, and social values of the nation. Their protest started a domino effect of conservative attacks that led to the draconian defunding of the NEA in 1995.[66]

Artists had come to rely on the NEA's presence, to "need" it not only financially, but as a mark of social and cultural validation within the greater arts community, a testament to the cultural and financial capital invested and returned (Jackson et al. 15). Publicly, artists witnessed their work and their appeals regarded as a needless "sense of entitlement" (Ziegler 153). The conservative attacks amounted to a discourse of entitlement that portrayed artist need as pathological and wasteful. The discourse of entitlement portrayed artists as elite and unfairly privileged. Such "privilege" could not be admired because it did not ascribe to the narrow notions of citizenship at the time (Berlant 5). The specific artists targeted directly or through spaces that presented them were queer women, and people of color who addressed race, class, gender, and sexual disparity in the nation. The artists included poets Sapphire and Marlon Riggs, filmmaker Isaac Julien, and performance artists Holly Hughes, Karen Finley, Tim Miller, and John Fleck. Effectively, the discourse of entitlement abstracted the contributions of artists to the state since before the Second World War.

I appreciate Kester's work for his attention to the role of rhetoric as well as his recognition that many artists who benefited from the support of the state were professionals who had trained through the bureaucratic structure. Kester does not shy away from the interdependency that developed between many artists and the NEA. Nor

---

[66] My argument is drawn from the effects of the culture wars, as well the appearances of "artist need" in U.S. patronage in the 20th century; consequently, I do not go into great detail on the culture wars. For more about this period, see Michael Brenson's *Visionaries and Outcasts* (2001) and Richard Bolton's *Culture Wars: Documents from the Recent Controversies on the Arts* (1992). Joseph Wesley Ziegler takes a neo-conservative view in his book, *Arts in Crisis: The National Endowment for the Arts versus America* (1994). See also Jane Alexander's *Command Performance: An Actress in the Theater of Politics* (2000) for an excellent account of the effects of the defunding of the NEA.

does he shy away from the fact that many individual artist programs and space initiatives benefited largely white, middle-class, and educated individuals. The cultural sector was marked by the same social disparities as the rest of the nation.[67] However, Kester's list of qualifiers proves scant when used to locate the specific artists targeted by cultural war cries. These artists included women, people of color, and queers—individuals who were marked by other forms of social alterity.

Between 1965 (the year the NEA was founded) and 2005, the number of nonprofits in the nation rose from 7,700 to more than 40,000 (Ivey, "America"). Former NEA Chair Bill Ivey and John Kreidler both admit that the nonprofit sector is now defined by need at the expense of its well-being. Ivey notes that between 1982 and 1997, fifteen years occupied by the alleged culture wars, the nonprofit sector grew by 80%, but average revenues decreased ("America"). Employment in the sector grew, but artists' compensation levels have remained the same (Kreidler, "Leverage" 160). Kreidler says that depressed levels of income are inherent in a patronage model. He likens the American patronage to a "Ponzi scheme" in which a finite number of investors "paid it forward" for others. At this point, the nonprofit sector has reached a natural end in a "systemic purgatory" of dwindling revenues ("Leverage," 151-152). The last ten years in the nonprofit environment have been marked by "depressed wages, a lack of capital, [as well as] defensive and conservative business practices" (Ivey, "America").[68] Most individuals working in the nonprofit sector have the same or lower level of income than nonprofit employees during the Ford Era, from 1950-1990 (Kreidler 160). Ivey notes that most organizations have responded by trying to fix the newer machine with older

---

[67] In *My American History: Lesbian and Gay Life During the Reagan Bush Years* (1994), novelist and cultural critic Sarah Schulman argues that lesbian and gay artists who were targeted by the NEA advanced their own careers over greater social justice victories or civic duties.

[68] Kreidler likens the funding of the nonprofit sector to a Ponzi scheme, the pyramid scheme in which a growing number of investors pay money forward, eventually leaving the last investors to carry the entire debt burden of payments.

tools ("America"). Nonprofit arts organizations in search of new revenues have promoted education programs, which have the benefit of serving future audiences, and they have gone looking for new sources of revenue in a field that is rife with need and short on resources ("America").[69]

In "Beyond Richard Florida: A Cultural Sector of Our Own," arts critic and consultant Ann Daly observes that the popularity of Florida's work and the other arguments correlating arts value and economic impact have "yielded no tangible benefits per se" (1). Her comments are based, in part, on the arts and culture funding program in Austin, a city touted as a creative leader by Florida.

Daly offers five proposals, based on an informal artist survey, to support cultural vitality. All five strategies directly address the discourse of need. First, "[t]he cultural sector needs to look beyond institution-building" (1). Daly notes that artists and arts organizers are overburdened by older nonprofit organizational models. Some artists are dispensing with nonprofits "altogether, choosing to remain informal." Some nonprofit organizations are reorganizing, eschewing the hierarchical board and manager structure for "flat organizations inspired by the collectives of the 1960s" (1). "Secondly, [t]he cultural sector needs to focus on infrastructure" (2). In this section, Daly adheres to expressive logic and offers value as the *sine qua non* for arts support. She argues that the cultural sector needs to rethink its meta-framework, and she offers *Investing in Creativity* as a source for change. Thirdly, "[t]he cultural sector needs to think and act systematically": "In order to truly develop our field in the long term, we need to take time to understand not just *that* we exist in a complex, interdependent system, but even more so *how* that system works" (2; emphasis in original). Similarly, my argument examines

[69] In a positivist spin, Ivey contends that the sum total of diminishing returns indicate not the fall of the nonprofits, but the indication that they have peaked in success and can now retire their predominant position ("America").

how current structures in the cultural sector were systematically constructed—whereas need informed their building, real need now serves as reason for change. Thus, Daly argues "[t]hat the cultural sector needs to anticipate the future strategically," and that the cultural sector needs to get past reactive models to proactive ones (2). Finally, "[t]he cultural sector needs interpretive advocates" (3).

Daly's work challenges me to think of how an artist's awareness of individual, communitarian, and historical needs can help independent artists approach their processes in productive and informed ways. The challenge for all artists seems not to be trying to fix older forms of patronage as they have been presented. Instead, artists should imagine new ones that are based on the knowledge and context of past circumstances.[70] With Daly's critique in mind, I turn to *Investing in Creativity*.

INVESTING IN CREATIVITY

Having heard about *Investing in Creativity* through colleagues in the academy and the National Performance Network, I awaited the publication in much the same way that Harry Potter fans await a next novel.[71] In some ways, I was not disappointed. In the period since its publication, *Investing in Creativity* has informed the nation's understanding of artists. The document follows the rubric of cultural policy; it expresses the lives and work of artists as "complex and mutable relationships, a way to think about issues, a set of tools for a rapidly changing future" (Bradfield "Defining" 12).

---

[70] In my chapter on support, I offer new model of support that intervenes on a traditional project grant program.

[71] Much like many a Harry Potter fan, I related to the protagonist's (in this case, "artist's") sense of feeling different, and anticipated a certain pleasure in reading a study that could explain what I felt and saw. In her review of the work, artist-scholar Patricia Moss-Vreeland describes *Investing in Creativity* as "a giant 'whodunit' to explore [quoting the document] 'why artists need more than creativity to survive'" ("Why Invest in Creativity?" 120).

Sponsored by thirty-eight state and private foundations, *Investing in Creativity* represents a moment when the various sectors vested in cultural policy came together in a discursive space to identify the conditions facing the nation's artists. The study was based on interviews among nine representative cities—Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Houston, Los Angeles, New York City, San Francisco, Seattle, and Washington D.C.—plus a composite look at artists working in rural areas (1, 5). The goal of the study is "to think in a new way about artists, how they work, and the mechanisms they need to support their creativity" (04).

Investing in Creativity was written by a team of writers from the Urban Institute led by policy analyst Maria-Rosario Jackson. The Urban Institute is a nonpartisan economic and social policy research organization established in 1968 at the recommendation of President Johnson; today the organization continues to "analyze policies, evaluate programs, and inform community development to improve social, civic, and economic well-being" (Urban Institute, "About Us"). The publication of *Investing in Creativity* was anticipated by two studies that framed *Investing*'s address to the needs of the cultural sector through the rubrics of public perception and expressive value, respectively; these studies were the Urban Institute's *American Perceptions of Artists* (2001) and *Culture Counts in Communities: A Framework for Measurement* (2002) by Maria-Rosario Jackson and Joaquin Herranz.

The study has contributed to several initiatives that continue its work. These initiatives include contributions of data to NYFA Source, a web-space database dedicated to the dissemination of support opportunities for the nation's artists through the New York Foundation for the Arts (http://www.nyfa.org). NYFA Source opportunities are divided by geography, discipline, and award or service type (Jackson et al. 5). *Investing* has contributed documentation to CPANDA, a website archive of studies, articles, and

initiatives in the cultural sector. Finally, the document has contributed most directly to Leveraging Investments in Creativity (LINC), "a ten-year national campaign to improve conditions for artists in all disciplines, so that artists can more readily do their creative work and contribute to community life" ("LINC"), which I examine at the end of the chapter.

Investing in Creativity seeks to "to expand [the nation's] thinking about who artists are, what they do and what mechanisms react to create a hospitable—or inhospitable—environment of support for their work" (Jackson et al. 3). As a rationale for its investigation, *Investing* states that artists play a critical role in the cultural well-being of the nation, and yet they are subject to situations of crisis:

> [A]rtists are a growing part of the U.S. workforce. But they are typically underpaid in relation to their education, skills, and societal contributions. Moreover, given the multiple roles they play in society, they are often under-recognized and undervalued by funders and policymakers both inside and outside the cultural sector, as well as by the media and the public at large. (3)

The introduction addresses broadly how artists are in need, how artists fill a need in the nation, and how artist need is overlooked. As this passage suggests, such a study avails itself of deconstructive methodologies by examining the interrelated workings of race, class, gender, sexuality, geography, and artistic medium.

Investing in Creativity takes a rhetorical turn of not directly addressing need as need, but framing needs within the rubric of "support." The approach appears to serve the document's constructive aims of advancing artist sustainability through six broad recommendations. The six "dimensions of support [include] validation,

demands/markets, material supports, training and professional development, communities and networks, and information" (Jackson et al. 5). By rendering "needs" as "supports," the document seems to make a very politically informed, but ahistorical, turn away from the misunderstood system of needs that contributed to the arguments of entitlement twenty years ago. In the following section, I reinscribe need into *Investing in Creativity*'s analysis. I do this as tool for clarification and as a political act. The re-appearance of need begs the question of how need emerged. Through my analysis, I answer those questions.

Artists Need Validation

"Validation" asks how society values the works of artists (8). Validations are broken into "contextual" issues and "direct" ones (9-15). Contextual validations replicate "instrumental" models, the term given to studies that attempt to argue for the value of art to society (Jensen 65-67). The need for validation comes from society's view of art as "frivolous," the fact that "[artists'] societal contributions are not well understood," and the distinct "visibility" of artists in the presence of institutions and products (Jackson et al. 10-15). The last two points speak to the ways in which the works of artists are abstracted through the processes of their creation and how the history of patronage has abstracted the professional efforts of artists. Many of these patronage practices are rooted in a Romantic era notion of artists as irrational and in need of support. The image of the "needy artist" has contributed to the discursive disappearance of public and private patron need (Abbing 39). The image of the "needy artist" has also abstracted the "work-for-hire" reality of many patron programs, during the WPA, through the NEA, and even private patronage, where benefactors benefited from support (Grampp 4).

Direct validations include collegiality ("peer recognition" and exchange) and community ("opportunities to connect with the public") (Jackson et al. 8). They include mainstream media coverage and community-recognition of diverse, culturally specific (Mexican-American, folk, Hmong) or interdisciplinary forms. They include access to grants and fellowships. *Investing in Creativity* notes that many artists are constricted from validation by geography. Spectator communities are defined by region, culture, language, and tradition. Appalachian musicians may or may not find crossover appeal in Los Angeles. A queer performance artist may not be welcome in Waco, a Texas city with a prominent Baptist university. The study notes that many artists recognize New York as a "hub" that either beckons them or stands as a troubling (even mocking) symbol of legitimacy in communities outside New York—to this list, I would add other cities, such as Los Angeles, Chicago, San Francisco, and Boston. The study notes that other forms of direct validation are fragile—alternative newspapers, networks, as well as culturally defined neighborhoods, communities, or festivals are subject to the forces of capital and globalism (14-19). Although the study does not say it explicitly, the networks addressed in this section are hierarchical in structure. As the expressive and instrumental arguments in favor of the arts suggest, contemporary media is informed by the history of need. Consequently, direct validations serve as references to the direct invalidations of the past through well-publicized crises in arts support at the state and national levels.

Artists Need to be Needed

"Demands/markets" refers to "[s]ociety's appetite for artists and what they do" and how "the markets . . . translate this appetite into financial compensation" (Jackson 5). Demands/markets address financial need directly. They point to the need for artists to work across markets, including nonprofit and for-profit models. They encourage artists

to vest creativity in diverse forms of artistic practice—like teaching or performing in non-arts venues. Demands/markets encourage artists to pursue innovative models of professionalism across the "commercial [. . .], nonprofit, public, and informal sectors" (21). *Investing in Creativity* notes that the cultural sector must make the public aware of hybrid markets such as "art and community development, social services, education, health, civic engagement, and youth engagement," as well as culture-specific markets. The study stresses the "need for intermediaries," such as organizations, alliances, and guilds that can provide a support structure for artists' work, effectively functioning as "cultural brokers." The study cites the National Performance Network as an excellent example of an intermediary organization already in existence (26-27). The presence of the NPN alongside other structures like the unrealized guild, begs the question of how one organization came into existence when others did not. Demands/markets express a need for new models of material practice based on longstanding and contemporary conditions (21-28).

Ann Daly succinctly characterizes "demands/markets" by saying the cultural sector needs infrastructural changes. Contemporary crises attending demands/markets result from the needs-based approaches and the nonprofit organizations that served artists in the past but now try to dodge appearances of entitlement by being labor-intensive, civic-minded, and self-justifying:

> Artists are exhausting themselves, endeavoring to make their art and patch up their arts community at the same time. They are trying to fill the vacuum of failed local service organizations. They are trying to respond to funder demand for institutional capacity-building without any support

> for general operations. They are trying to mentor their young colleagues. ("Beyond" 2).

Daly's comments apply contemporary practices to historical structures of organizations, which were based on need. By calling the conditions of the past ill-suited to today, her comments justify Pottenger's call for a guild and Arce's call for an artist-based organization comparable to the National Performance Network (Telephone Interview). Such organization may come from a variety of sources—informal alliances, education, formal organizations—but it will be better understood if it is presented in the context of past needs-based relationships such as the relationship of public/private patrons and artists.

Artists Need the Basics

"Material supports" are at the heart of the *Investing in Creativity*. They include "employment, insurance and similar benefits, awards, space, equipment, and materials." With respect to employment, the authors note that the "typical employment patterns for artists" include holding multiple jobs, "fluid employment patterns," and wages that are comparably lower than workers in other professions with the same level of education (30). Many artists lack health insurance: "51 percent of artists pay for health insurance compared with 8 percent of U.S. workers" (33) With respect to awards and grants, the authors write that awards differ by discipline—performance artists have some of the fewest, along with folk artists. The study notes that state-based awards differ by region, but do not supply detail on the nature or amount for the awards (36-39). More importantly, they note artists' ambivalence about award systems—demographics, disinterest, and distrust for processes which some artists assume "award the best grant

writers, not the best artists" (44). Space and materials issues include gentrification, the raising of rents and property values in districts that have been settled and revived in part by artists and those who follow them (46-50). *Investing in Creativity* also notes the different material needs of the different disciplines, some of which are costly with respect to equipment or space needed (54-55).

For independent performing artists, "material supports" refers to a host of needs left unattended over the history of separation between artists and nonprofits. Many nonprofits developed according to a corporate model, supplying benefits to employees. Artists only "came in" to these organizations as contract labor for the development and/or presentation of development of art work. Artists who did not organize and institutionalize in such circumstances as the "artist space movement" fended independently (Kester 117). The acceptance of separate circumstances and types of material supports between artists and arts organizations represents a site of coercion, a hegemony that is subject to rearticulation. The leverage lost in nonprofit patronage, the overwhelming number of material needs, as well as a history of artists organizing around "need" suggests that artists could, once again, pursue the basics collectively (Kriedler, "Leverage" 157). Such professionalization might appear in Pottenger's guild model. As Ann Daly states, artists have begun to address their needs by "blurring" nonprofit and for-profit models as "artists aggressively identify and structure earned income streams for their art [and] their skill sets." Daly offers examples of for-profit galleries run by artists or bed-and-breakfasts that have arts gallery components (1). Independent performers need to leverage their work together, whether it be sharing information about fees or constructing teaching "collectives" so that a performer who is on tour can be covered if an artist is appearing in an education program at home.

Artists Need Training

Investing in Creativity notes that training and professional development includes "conventional and lifelong learning opportunities" through professional training programs and travel or exchange programs, including access to state, city or community arts councils and agencies and networks for training (7). The study acknowledges that foundations and other organizations are beginning to pay more attention to the value of training (59-64).

Within this section, I noticed the term "best practice" rubric of "do as I have done" that has long been employed by the NPN (*Directory* 4). "Best practice" implies that one model fits all. I have always found "best practice" to be both effective and troubling. A best practice example—such as a well-marketed show—is helpful to any artist. However, each artist must attend to what makes his or her work especially unique; economists call this "differentiating" (Caves 5). Best practice is always a call for a dialectical approach.

The "need" for training refers to the lack of training that has attended the systematic shifts in the nonprofit sector over the last twenty-five years. The independent performing artists that I examine continue to appear in nonprofit spaces defined by need. When the nonprofit arts sector was robust, artists professionalized through best and repeated practice; however, the nonprofit sector was once more thriving. The need for training is historical, but it must also be presented in context as present needs that are informed by past circumstances.

Artists Need Each Other

"Communities and networks" address how artists are connected within the cultural sector and to society at-large (Jackson et al. 65). Communities are not defined

specifically; however, the need for understanding community is historical. State and private programs of patronage have always targeted needs within defined regions (Townsend 265). The defunding of the NEA resulted from the conservative backlash against individuals who did not fit a narrow definition of mainstream in the largely conservative nation of the Reagan era (Kester 103).[72]

Rather than define what community is, *Investing in Creativity* examines community through how it operates. The study presents networks as a series of nodes connecting individuals within and beyond the cultural sector. These models include national networks, such as the National Performance Network, and regional networks such as Alternate ROOTS, an organization of artists in the Southeast to which I belong as a "satellite" member because of my geographical location outside the southeast (65-75). Networks include community-based organizations, such as the National Association of Latino Arts and Culture (NALAC), an arts service organization for the U.S. Latino/a community, which I examine in the next chapter. The networks based on institutional affiliations or funders, such as the Creative Capital Foundation, an independent artist fellowship and training organization which I examine in my last chapter. Finally, there are "personal networks" drawn from simple alliances. These networks include the friends and colleagues in local communities or across distances, such as Arce and myself (65-69).

Many of the networks that the document presents are hierarchical in orientation. Their structure emerged from their nonprofit status. They serve as hubs to programs based on older models of support. *Investing* recognizes that many of these organizations are "fragile." They are "under-sourced and over-stretched." They are "longstanding

[72] Alternate ROOTS (Regional Organization of Theaters South) defines community as a group of people drawn together by "place, tradition, and/or spirit" (ROOTS, "About Us"). I find this definition very simple and effective.

leaders" facing change or at-risk. They are trying to find new ways to make bridges outside the cultural sector (71-73). By framing these structures in the context of support, rather than a historically defined notion of need, *Investing in Creativity* implicitly argues for the maintenance of traditional organizations and puts faith in informal networks to fill in the gaps (75). Kriedler has shown that the nonprofit structure, built on a leveraging model in which artists receive assistance in anticipation of matched funds is in "systemic purgatory" (*Leverage* 158). Artists cannot rely on the matched funds, or the seed money. A more current approach to communities and networks would look at the new forms of organizations growing. Daly outlines structures that "hybridize the for-profit and the non-profit [. . .], structures like subsidiaries and limited partnership models" (*Beyond* 1). Daly continues:

> Artists are devising revenue-generating projects that exploit artistic skills, provide artist employment, and leverage assets (like real estate or costume/set inventories), while contributing to the core mission. The ideological line between "for-profit" and "non-profit" is blurring, as artists aggressively identify and structure earned income streams for their art, their skill sets (e.g., pilates and technical, business, or arts consulting), their rental space, and their intellectual property. (1)

Unlike past, needs-based models, these rely on resources available in the moment with revenues planned over a long run.

As I argue in my chapter on networks, networks inform all aspects of contemporary organization. Networks are part of the support ecology in much the same way that systems of patronage served older models. Likewise, artists should understand how need informs the organizations that are serving as networks now and determine—on their own and collectively—what networks serve them.

Artists Need this Book

The final category in *Investing in Creativity*, "Information" returns to the opening theme: "[g]ood decision-making about the allocation of resources and program design requires good information and knowledge" (Jackson et al. 76). The authors assert that society needs to have more information about artists to be able to understand and appreciate us. Artists need more information about each other, awards, training, markets, space, and new employment models (78-80). As my analysis has shown, this information would benefit from a historical perspective on artist need. As Daly has noted, there must also be an end to circular information and that study must, at some point, go into practice:

> My office floor is littered with piles of research reports, meeting reports, convening reports, initiative reports, funding reports, economic impact reports, and the list continues. They come from foundations, think tanks, academic journals, governmental agencies, service organizations, advocacy groups, scholarly organizations, consulting firms, and the like. The result is a welcome (if chaotic) increase in information, but has our influence expanded apace? ("Beyond" 3)

By calling for a context that frames artist "need" in past and present iterations, I ask for skills of discernment among artists. Which of these studies fits within a context of past need, or better, projects past needs onto present circumstances? How might a clean office floor, with past need appropriately placed within seeing distance, provide a space for artists to creatively address present need? *Investing in Creativity* is a rich and broad

study, a bit of much "needed" reading, but it is also a call for a historicization. The needs of patrons, the state, and the artists have all been present in recent cultural history, and the needs of patrons and the state are rarely accounted for in studies and initiatives. As my examination of Leveraging Investments in Creativity shows, information about progressive practice based on studies (even *Investing in Creativity*) is necessary, but it can be hard to get.

From Need to Practice: Postscript

As its name suggests, Leveraging Investments (LINC) is a 10-year campaign begun in response to the *Investing in Creativity* publication. The organization is funded by the same consortium of funders who supported *Investing in Creativity*.

LINC qualifies the "six dimensions of support" by pursuing them through three "Strategic Goals":

> [LINC is dedicated to] "expanding financial supports for artists' work[;] improving artists' access to essential material supports such as live/work space, insurance, equipment and professional development[; and] bolstering knowledge, networks, and public policies that enhance artists' work and their contributions to communities. (LINC, "About LINC").

LINC pursues its three goals through seven programs, which are largely rooted in networking technologies. The "Artography Project" and "Artists in a Global Society" and "Creative Communities" all have financial support components (goal 1). Artography is a national grant program that plans to award large ($50,000 to $100,000) general

operating expense grants to 8-12 organizations.[73] The Creative Communities represents ongoing research and intervention in the planning and implementation of change in ten key cities: Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Houston, Los Angeles, New York City, Philadelphia, San Francisco, Seattle, and Washington D.C. The Artists in a Global Society program seeks to nurture immigrant Cambodian artists and to provide exchange opportunities. Two more of LINC's programs, the "National Artists Space Initiative" and the "National Artists Insurance Initiative" use networking technologies to collect and exchange information about opportunities, policies, programs, and procedures with these aspects of material support (goal 2). "Artists Count" and the "LINC Information Network" represent the organization's research and network development initiatives; these initiatives disseminate knowledge about the field at-large to both artists and communities (goal 3) ("LINC Matters").

LINC has been slow to report on its development and progress. *Investing in Creativity* addresses the breadth of change needed, the tenuousness and exhaustion in the field, and a desire to proceed with caution, perhaps too much. The recipients of Artography project grants that were to be announced for last July have not been made public, and my searches through databases have turned up nothing. My requests for information from LINC have gone unanswered. The LINC information network is slow in coming. Coverage of LINC is limited to occasional inferences of what it might mean. Ann Daly gestures to a "movement afoot" by citing LINC, but does not provide details ("Beyond" 3). Over the months that I have been reading the website, I have noticed that changes are slow. At a conference in summer 2005, I served on a panel with LINC President Sam Miller and Ann Daly. Miller shared a couple of images of installations and performances from the pilot project that led to the Artography project, but offered no

[73] Because most grant programs are project-related, operational expenses are some of the rarest forms of support (Jeffri 61).

insight into upcoming programs. When I asked for some, he referred me to the website. The website lists its "Creative Communities" programs as "in process" in all ten cities. Similarly, the "Global Communities" webpage, much like the "Artography" page, refers readers to the program director rather than to articles.

The experience of finding nothing on LINC, even amid the sea of reports that are published in the cultural policy sector daily, points to an abundance of studies and a disunity of actions today. That LINC proved so difficult to find revealed one more need to be address: the need for disclosure.

DIVESTING WISDOMS

San Antonio, May 21, 2005. Renita Martin, Laurie Carlos, and I sat down in a restaurant at three in the afternoon. I had come expecting to talk to Martin, so Carlos's presence was a pleasant surprise, a two-for-one—a bit of abundance foreshadowing a conversation that repeatedly returned to the theme of "abundance." Martin and Carlos had just come from a rehearsal of *Five Bottles and a Six-Pack*, a show that Martin wrote and performs with bassist Jane Wang. Carlos directed the show. Originally, I wanted to interview Martin because she is a New York-based artist who was touring to San Antonio through an NPN Residency contract; however, our conversation so provocatively negotiated between discourses and circumstances of need that I decided to excerpt it here.

Renita Martin is an African-American lesbian performance artist and teacher who grew up in Mississippi, moved to Boston in the early 1990s and to New York in 2002. Like me she had begun her performance career as a solo artist before diversifying. She started her own nonprofit, Rhythm Vision Productions, Inc., an arts education organization for inner-city youth in Boston. She continues to make her own work and to appear in plays, such as Lettie Neal's *Last Rites*, a two-woman show about an African-

American lesbian's struggle with cancer, which I saw in 2004. I first met Martin in the mid 1990s at The Theater Offensive in Boston, a queer theater company that presented Martin's work frequently and commissioned *Five Bottles and a Six-Pack* (Nesti, "Theater"). After our first meeting, Martin and I shared email addresses and a few exchanges about possible bookings. Over the years, we continued to see each other at various conferences, including several OutWrite queer writers' conferences in Boston in the mid-1990s and the National Performance Network Annual Meeting in Los Angeles in December 2004, where Jump-Start Co-Artistic Director Lisa Suarez, Education Director Steve Bailey, and I saw a video of *Five Bottles* and talked about bringing Martin to San Antonio.

Five Bottles and a Six-Pack is a multi-character performance piece drawn from Martin's experience of living with multiple personality disorder. Throughout the show, six faces of Martin address the audience. They are alternately confrontational and streetwise, funny and endearing, solemn and morose. Martin's mostly solo performance is accompanied by Wang's music. When *Five Bottles and a Six Pack* first opened at The Theater Offensive, *Boston Globe* correspondent Caroline Nesbitt wrote, "Renita Martin has developed something of an understandable reputation as a Boston treasure" (Double Dose). *Globe* critic Robert Nesti called it "a remarkable piece performed by an artist with mesmerizing skill" ("Theater").

Because of Martin's experiences with mental health issues, her residency work was suited to Jump-Start's education program. During her one week residency, Martin taught workshops at Fairweather Lodge, a residential home for adults living with mental illness; in turn, Lodge residents attended Martin's show and participated in talkbacks.

Laurie Carlos is a distinguished performer who has had a vibrant and varied career as a director, writer, choreographer, and performer. She originated the role of

"The Lady in Blue" in Ntozake Shange's *For Colored Girls Who've Considered Suicide/When the Rainbow is Enuf*. She was a collaborator and co-founder of Urban Bush Women, a prominent movement and performance troupe, and worked alongside well-known performance artists Jessica Hagedorn and Robbie McCauley in the 1980s group, Thought Music. She has received Obie and Bessie Awards (Dolan, "*The Feminist Spectator"*).

I first "met" Carlos as a spectator when I saw her performing the role of Granny Hannah in the 1992 touring production of *Praise House* by the Urban Bush Women. I was captivated by Carlos's presence and energy. *New York Times* dance critic Anna Kisselgoff wrote that much of the performance was "carried by the exceptional Miss Carlos" ("Blacks' Realities").

In 2001, I took a performance workshop Carlos gave at the Hyde Park Theater where she was directing Sharon Bridgforth's play, *Con Flama*. One of her exercises had me questioning the intrusiveness of her pedagogy: two people share a secret they have never told and then report to the group at large on the secrets they heard. The participants were not warned beforehand that they would be sharing them. Carlos explained that she wanted us to feel that rawness of exposure. No one protested, and many participants cried that night as their personal lives were brought forth. I knew Carlos to be bold, and she did not disappoint me.

When we sat down to eat, I told Martin and Carlos about my project, and asked them to tell me about how they supported themselves and their work. Carlos began by announcing the theme that dominates her life, abundance:

> I've been in this business since I was 15 years old; I'm now 56. What I've learned: the ideas around prosperity, and creative energy, and abundance are endless. And when I was thinking in terms of limitations, I was sick

> all the time; I worried continuously, about not only how much money I had, but how much creative energy I had. Now, I have found out in the last ten years that that [i.e. money/creativity/wellness] is an unlimited situation, as long as I want it to be. So I have much better health [now] than I have had in my whole life.

Carlos's statement appeared to make an implicit relationship between needs and perception, or consciousness. Needs are finite and ephemeral, a momentary breach of faith, really. A consciousness of abundance guided her in having her needs met and knowing they would be met. Against greater discourses and circumstances of need, including those needs addressed in *Investing in Creativity*, Carlos's comment came off as a very ethereal. When she said, "I've learned," she acknowledged that her career longevity had contributed to abundance, because longevity allowed her to gain awareness. She did not admit to having greater access to opportunities because of her track record in professional productions. By her own account, Carlos entered the field around 1964, around the same time that the NEA was founded. By that time, the "Off-Broadway" movement had been thriving for well over a decade. The "Artist Space Movement" would soon begin (Kester 118). Carlos did not acknowledge the material advantages of history, her own or anyone else's. Martin was nodding during Carlos's comments, and I wondered if Carlos's responses were meant to witness to me and Martin—to convince us all that we were better for not needing more than the air to breathe, food to eat, and the opportunity to make work. I was incredulous. I asked her to tell me how she had come around to experiencing "abundance."

Carlos said that her consciousness came from an amalgamation of experiences and insights based on material success. She raised a daughter, now thirty-five, on her

salary as a working artist. She said that her income today is determined by what she asks for and what she is willing to make. "I wanna lot of money," she told me in one instance, "and so I ask for it." One sentence later she said, "I sometimes choose to work for free." Carlos added, "I have friends who get twenty million for a motion picture, and I have friends who can't pay any of their bills." When I asked if she has health insurance, she responded with an emphatic no: "Do you know what happened when I had insurance? I got sick a lot! Oh yeah! I had insurance for five years when I worked at Penumbra Theater [in Minneapolis], and I had to go to these doctors twice a month."

I told her that I had been sick until I got insurance, and then the sickness had gone away. Having insurance made me feel as if I could withstand whatever needs came up.

Carlos countered with another story. She was once subject to depression and because of that she had to be cautious about putting herself in situations of dependency:

> There's a chemical disease in my family. I had to put those drugs down in the seventies. I suffered withdrawals, and then I had to face the day. You get to the point of moving past. Of moving in the hard time, so that you can always answer to your own prosperity and abundance.

Although I did not know Martin's experiences yet, I had a feeling that Carlos was again witnessing to her. By advancing abundance, Carlos did not address individual forms of capital that she already had and used to make work. Her account of withdrawals was profound, but quick. Her witness did not account for others who, for whatever reason, still required medication.

I recognize that my own experiences of need, sickness, even success had given me a "meta-awareness" of the field and faith in my own practice. Like Carlos, my awareness was earned through difficult circumstances, but my awareness did not prevent

me from wanting to improve circumstances and conditions, to budget my income and expense, to maintain health insurance and good health, to feel that my work is sufficiently remunerated, and to know or hear about the mechanisms of a successful practice in addition to testimonies of faith.

I was overwhelmed by Carlos's assertions and interested in hearing from Martin, and so I finally asked Martin to tell me about how she supports herself and her work. Martin immediately deferred to Carlos: "Laurie and I have talked a lot about abundance," she said. And then she explained the needs that marked her life in recent years:

> I moved from Boston to New York to do the commercial thing. But since I got to New York, I've just written one piece—I used to do two or three a year. A lot of [my stress was] about that struggle, that hustle, when I didn't know where [the income] was coming from. I think that a lot of what has been keeping me from writing is the idea that my work is based on someone else's acknowledgement of this work, or that the worth is based on how much you get paid. And since I wasn't, at the time, getting paid, I just sort of went into a lull, and thought about going in a different direction. I had a job, a nine-to-five sort of thing, for about seven months, I think, and I had a nervous breakdown, and just about lost my mind.

The trope of moving to New York and "making it" is common to the performance field. Unlike Carlos, Martin did not have an extensive history with New York. Her many needs emerged full force upon coming to the city. She needed to support herself; she needed to be writing; she needed to know whether she could continue to make performance. These

needs had real material consequences. Martin explained that her stress had contributed to a mental and emotional breakdown in 2002. She had been living on Social Security disability ("SSI") since then.

Martin added that she had grown weary of her life as an individual marked by social and economic need. Her SSI threatened her ability to grow as a working artist. Martin explained that she would have to pay all of her income from her Jump-Start gig back to SSI because she could not make additional money as a condition of her disability. Martin indicated that she is considering going off her SSI assistance: "It's been helpful, because I have been sick a lot emotionally and physically, but it's a cycle and so right now I'm up for review, and I'm considering just stopping it. I'm trying to figure out a transition." Shortly thereafter, she said, "I'm considering starting a nonprofit to support my work." The tenuousness of her situation—going from disability to self-dependence—points to the threats that face those in need in this country. By leaving her disability behind, she faced a large transition, one in which her resilience might be different from Carlos's. By saying she was considering starting another nonprofit to support her work, she was committing to a high degree of work and probable exhaustion (Daly, "Beyond" 1).

Despite their own situations and circumstances of need, both artists discussed how their own recognition of needs had supported their desires to take care of other artists' needs. Carlos said that that she only recently gave up running Moving Spirits Dance Co., when she realized that she had been placing others' needs first in order to avoid her own: "This is the year that I finally got it: 'You will have to take care of yourself, or you will have to walk around and pick up yourself in fucking pieces.'"

Martin, on the other hand, still sends money back to the Rhythm Vision Productions, Inc., the educational nonprofit she founded. Martin said: "I was raised to

give by my grandmother. I just see the need and want to respond to it." Martin added that traditionally she has had a problem paying herself when she works for the organization, but her work with Carlos had influenced her to start doing so.

The disparity between Carlos and Martin seemed great. And Carlos's attempt to bridge the need with a discourse of abundance alone bothered me. Carlos's comments positioned her as a perceived ally of Martin's and set the tone for a bold, though somewhat one-note, conversation about needs. More so than Carlos's, Martin's needs were present, demanding, and concrete in conversation. Her readiness for a "transition" indicated her intent not to have the notion of "need" mark her or the forces of bureaucracy restrain her life and art. It seemed equally possible that Martin was resisting the narrow discourses of artist need that haunt the intimate public sphere.

Carlos interrupted to make a point about semantics, effectively thickening the conversation around the connotations of the civic sector: "It's that language, 'not-for-profit.' It's like welfare. It's diminishing. It always makes you think about yourself in a somewhat minimal way. And in order to be prosperous, you have to make a decision at some point that you deserve [prosperity]."

Artists must be aware of and able to differentiate the structures of need that haunt our lives. In truth, we should see "need" as an historical condition that challenges us to make innovations, but to speak our place in the moment. We must know our needs, but also the way that needs have worked through our field, and whose needs are being met in turn, so that we are not subject to rhetorics of entitlement. We must be able to get past the for-profit and not-for-profit dyad, and work in a hybrid market. We may use immaterial aspects, such as the symbolic value we place on making art or working community, to motivate ourselves, but we must rely on specific, targeted practices that address material needs.

At the end of our conversation, Carlos and Martin were ready to act. Carlos predicted her abundant future based on what the abundant past has taught her. "I still have to publish all my old performances," she said. She explained that she has dozens which she plans to publish "this year." She was finishing a novel. She had directing jobs waiting. She had plays still in her. She had contributed and continues to contribute to our field in so many ways: "I've been able, in my life, to establish whole new genres of work through my own ideas and inspiration, and to change radically the kind of work that gets done in the world, and what kind of artists are in the world making work." I noticed that in defining her career, Carlos had not dismissed the idea of working with other people, but that she had decided to focus on her own work. I noted that Carlos had not dismissed the possibility of doing charitable work. She had merely challenged herself to consider her own needs first.

As we were nearing the end of an hour, I asked both artists if they had final comments. Martin, who had been silent for much of the time, spoke first:

> Just that it's a process . . . and I feel more possibilities than I did a few years ago. And part two, my heroes are the people who died, and struggled, and were crazy, and so I had the idea you had to do that, be crazy and poor, but that's bullshit. Their suffering should make it easier for me to not have to suffer.

Martin's comments gestured to another rhetoric, one common to civil rights discourse—that the privileges of today are based on the sacrifices of the past. Carlos's comments went back even further: "I say to my daughter, you don't have to pick cotton, chop wood, suck some white man's dick. You wake up each morning and you're a free black woman. I don't have to do anything I don't want to do."

Both artists located themselves in historical discourses, but they refused to address artist need as structurally informed. Martin's allusion to civil rights and Carlos's to slavery, seemed to indicated their sense of battles already won and their resilience to go forward. For me these two comments in particular resonated with and troubled Berlant's notion of the "intimate public sphere." The two artists appeared ready to claim the American dream, without examining the conditions that differentiated their resources as African-American women artists in the early twenty-first century. Carlos and Martin resisted addressing themselves as in need; it was undignified in light of past struggle. It was an act of succumbing to the shackles of the past. To resist the attacks of the "intimate public sphere" they spoke of social, cultural, and financial abundance and generosity as a pledge to hard work. Under Carlos's prompting, they experienced an abundance of opportunity, confidence, even faith, and freedom. In a final show of faith in her abundance and perhaps demand for capital abundance, Carlos picked up the tab for lunch.

The boldness and sureness of Carlos's approach overwhelmed me at first. Barber uses the term "libertarian" to refer to a society that disregards the influence and intercession of the state and allows for the market to take precedence (17). Libertarians prize choice and competition. In the libertarian model, successful outcomes amount to a zero-sum gain. Someone's success is another person's loss. When I first read Barber's approach, I imagined the big business entrepreneurs of the Reagan era or today under the Bush administration. But Carlos's assertions also hailed the libertarian model, if not financially, then certainly in its counterstance to bureaucratic structures and the social safety net. Was getting past need merely a matter of disregarding it? Carlos did not address zero-sum gains explicitly, but she implied them through her casual acknowledgement of those friends who make millions and those who cannot pay their

bills. To her, the difference between the two parties was not money, but their perceptions of being well-off or not. By remaining steadfast in the immaterial realm of abundance, she did not have to address or succumb to long-held assumptions of artist need. Indeed, she appeared to have conquered need for the moment. Her story about learning to take care of herself rather than projecting needs onto her grown daughter indicated that she was still learning how to claim abundance, but that she was on the path. Abundance, itself, was her process.

But I have argued, Carlos's approach was ahistorical. Artist "need" has been a key association since the Romantic age, though especially in the last century as systems of patronage have emerged to suit the needs of artists, as well as patrons and the state. The identification of need solely with artists and arts organizations has abstracted greater financial, cultural, and poltical needs both met and ongoing elsewhere in the nation's cultural sector.

Likewise, *Investing in Creativity*'s use of "supports" to hide "needs" showed the authors' resistance to taking on the controversial term. The failure of the document to synthesize the term "need" in context with a history of patronage opened a gap between present conditions and new tactics for redress.

I believe that "need" must be embraced by artists, not as an end but as a beginning of consciousness. How were needs of the cultural sector met in the past, and whom did those responses serve? What operational structures and practices in the cultural sector exist today as a result of needs-based responses? In other words, how does an artist's "ask" for money or resources represent not a presumption of entitlement, but an available structure of recompense. How might an artist mediate an existing or past structure with a new and/or radical approach? As Daly notes, how might an artist take advantage of non-profit resources and for-profit opportunities to create a thriving and supported career?

CHAPTER FOUR: "ESTABLISHING SUPPORT"

"The National Association of Latino Arts and Culture (NALAC) is dedicated to the preservation, development, and promotion of the cultural and artistic expressions of the diverse Latino populations of the United States. Through this effort, NALAC is committed to the continuing struggle for the elimination of racism, ageism, and discrimination against gay, lesbian, and physically-challenged populations. The objective is to recognize and support the varied standards of excellence grounded in the aesthetics and traditions of our root cultures.

—"Our Mission," NALAC, 2006.

"The Latino/a Performance Initiative (LPI) is a project-based coalition that supports equally the creation of new performance and the development of independent performing artists by taking a materialist approach to each artist's projects and practices. In doing so, we not only support our work as artists, but find new ways to make performance careers available to others."

—Paul Bonin-Rodriguez (NALAC "Grant Application," 2005).

"They took me aside and said that if I'm going to be an artist, I should be careful not to get too much into the nonprofit administration, because then I would get addicted to the paycheck."

—Amalia Ortiz, "Interview," 2005.

"Is he saying if we don't give him the full amount, he won't do the project?"

—Peer Panel Comments (NALAC "Grant Application," 2005).

What does support mean to an independent performing artist? How does an artist find, engage in, procure, and/or use support? How do relationships among artists within the cultural sector define and embody support? I answer these general questions using the specific example of a grant application that attempted to model support among colleagues.

In June 2005, I applied to the National Association of Latino Arts and Cultures (NALAC) to form the Latino/a Performance Initiative (LPI), a collaborative project with three artists from San Antonio, Amalia Ortiz, José Rubén De León, and María Ibarra. Through the LPI project, which was focused on mutual support, I wanted to intervene in

the competitive individualizing aspects of traditional grant programs. Like many grant opportunities, the NALAC program proposed to fund individual projects, artistic collaborations focused on product, or organizations. (NALAC, Guidelines). Through the LPI, we sought to model a project that supported artist process alongside product.

The seeds of the project were sown during a conversation with Ortiz, Ibarra and De León, which I hoped to include in my dissertation. By allowing the conversation to go from theory to practice, I returned to a civic role that I have played before as an artist and activist committed to San Antonio's cultural community. In addition, I attempted to use my skills as an artist-citizen-scholar as a resource that all of us could share. As this chapter reveals, my colleagues have also offered their skills as artists-citizens-scholars to diverse regional, cultural, and artist disciplinary communities.

Also, the space of our meeting and regular association—Jump-Start Performance Co.—served as a potent reminder to me that my work has never entirely been about just "me." Since 1992, I have been a member of a group of twenty artists who support each other in making new work. De León, Ibarra, and Ortiz are not in the company, but they have all worked at Jump-Start in various capacities. In general, Jump-Start remains a site of support for us. Through the LPI project, which was proposed to have taken place at Jump-Start, I was able to see more clearly how support is both a communal and individual proposition. In this chapter, I use the model of our interactions to interrogate support practices, innovations, benefits, and cost coming together in a simple moment of coordination and reflection.

SUPPORT DEFINED

According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, the word support was adapted from the French infinitive "supporter" in 1382 to refer to economic and personal assistance as

well as military alliances. Support, as a noun, refers to "the action, or an act, of preventing a person from giving way." This kind of support is not only physical. It addresses "spiritual help; also subjectively, mental comfort." The second definition refers to "the bearing or defraying of a charge or expense." The third definition refers to "the maintenance of life"; the fourth refers to weight-bearing constructions such as beams and trusses. The word "support" fluidly moves among the physical, the spiritual and the financial. Support as a noun addresses an incompleteness or imbalance that is alleviated by the object itself.

The verb definitions start from the realm of physical and emotional and move to the financial. "To support" means "to endure without opposition or resistance [. . .], to tolerate." It means "to strengthen the position of (a person or community) by one's assistance, countenance, or adherence [. . .], to stand by, back up." The third definition is "to assert, to maintain." Support also means to "bear expenses." Support as a verb implies a negotiation in which needs are recognized and addressed.

As playwright Aaron Landsman notes, independent artists can take advantage of eight mechanisms of support for their work. These include "individual donations" from supporters and "fellowships," such as the Creative Capital Fellowship, which I examine in the next chapter. Support mechanisms also include "project grants" such as the NALAC grant and the support of government agencies, like the NEA programs that continue to be channeled through intermediary funding organizations. "Service organizations," like the National Performance Network, provide support. Support also includes "in-kind goods and services"; the photography, graphic design, and mailing services I secured for my first show were all in-kind. "Earned income for services," include box office "splits," where artists share net or gross proceeds with the theater. The

final mechanism of support is "earned income for goods, such as publications or video sales that take advantage of *ars longa* ("art lasts") properties (Landsman 3-4).

As these mechanisms suggest, independent performers receive support through a network of relations. Support programs rely on an essential connectedness and consistency of relationships (Castells, *Rise* 171).[74] Some of these support relationships may be direct, as in the case of donors who offer financial assistance or colleagues who offer in-kind services to an artist. Some relationships have a quid pro quo nature. When making BREAD, Jaclyn received assistance in exchange for past or future services rendered to other artists. Jaclyn referred to the trade as part of a "barter economy." Her notion of a barter economy alluded to the temporal quality of support. Support relations are worked out over time (Landsman 3-4). Some support relationships are mediated by organizations. Many organizations make stated "gifts" to artists in the forms of fellowships and grants, but many of these grants also have a "work-for-hire" aspect. The gifting, in this case, becomes a form of contract labor in which the individual assumes a tax responsibility for the work (Grampp 41).

Many of the support relationships derive from hierarchical network structures that support independent performing artists. These network relations trade on social and cultural capital. In a barter economy, one partner might argue that the value of her contribution is greater; it represents more social and cultural capital. The negotiation may be worked out through like a market transaction. Grants, fellowships, and service organizations frequently require a certain amount of cultural and social capital. The need for social and cultural capital is apparent when artists apply for grants. Many grants require artists to have at least two years of professional experience as an artist before

[74] "The performance of a network will depend on its two fundamental attributes: its *connectedness*, that is its structural ability to facilitate noise-free communication between its components, [and] its *consistency*, that is the extent to which there is sharing of interests between the network's goals and the goals of its components" (Castells, *Rise* 171; emphasis in original).

applying (Creative Capital, MAP). The need for social and cultural capital in obtaining these systems of support become apparent when a group of peer panelists meets to review grant and fellowship proposals (Brenson 109-112).

Support may come from a community to an individual, or it may be gifted back to the community from individuals. Gift relations may be founded in shared beliefs, values, and a "sense of solidarity" (Flores, *Los Pastores* 151).[75] Some support relationships are characterized by a generosity, in a decidedly "anti-market" approach (Abbing 39).

Support is about assistance. Support may unite people in a common circumstance, or it may provoke people to be competitive. Borrowing from network theory, I submit that support among individual artists comes from a simple equation of relations between two points of connection, that of me and you. I use the terms "me" and "you" to mean something both great and simple. The term resonates with the very simple duality expressed in the OED definition in which "you" may be an individual or a legion, as in a system of patronage or a military operation. Likewise the term allows for hierarchical network properties in which "you" and "me" may be a "hub" and a "node," respectively. "You," the other, may be the National Performance Network serving as a hub to me and my individual career. In the face of the organization, I may serve as a node, who receives supply-side support.

Support can be cultivated by the individual or offered to her or him. Support as "me and you" reflects the group identity of independent artists forged through systems of patronage, as well as communities drawn by place, tradition, or spirit. The party of "me" represents the potentially competitive and/or collaborative nature of a performer's work, which "we" face in our field of performance. Likewise, the party of "we" may represent

[75] "The gifting of performance, therefore, is the reciprocal process of performance and gratitude that engages performers and audience in a cyclical event founded in shared communication, social solidarity, and mutual obligation" (Flores, *Los Pastores* 151).

the "network as a leviathan," into which an individual struggles to have access, such as competitive grant programs.

Bruno Frey's notion of "crowding theory" has been especially instructive to my thoughts about how support is received and how it sustains an artist's work. Crowding theory characterizes individual motivation as a product of supportive relationships between symbolic and material rewards, values, and assistance, which are coordinated through internal (intrinsic) and external (extrinsic) forces. Internal aspects include a) the pleasure of an experience, b) a perception of fairness and security, and c) the accomplishment of an individual goal (Frey and Osterloh 8). External forces are material rewards given in exchange for a task or accomplishment. They may be characterized by their "controlling [or] informing aspect" (14).

The "crowding" of crowding theory refers to the effect of external forces on the internal ones. When a *controlling* external reward is introduced to a task that already has a high internal, or symbolic, value, it tends to "crowd out" motivation. For example, a child who likes doing homework will become less self-motivated over time when a system of external rewards is implemented. Crowding out is often present during incidents of "NIMBY, or not-in-my-backyard." In this instance, a community may recognize the value of nuclear disposal, but may not want such disposal in its own region. If a monetary reward is offered to the community – essentially an attempted buyout for approval – it may have a galvanizing effect on the community's resistance, because money is instantly viewed as attempting to control the community's symbolic value for its own well-being. Conversely, if the community is impoverished and its citizens see the money as *informing*, or supporting, its desire to care for its families, then the same money may actually "crowd in" intrinsic motivation and effectively bolster it. "Crowding-in" describes how an individual will be motivated to follow a course of action in the play of

internal and external motivation. (Frey 144-145; Frey and Osterloh 8-13). If, for instance, an artist designs a program, budgets time and expenses, and writes a grant, and receives the full amount requested, he may be motivated to fulfill the obligations, because the amount rewarded honors his planning and conceit. The grant then crowds-in his experience. If, however, he is asked to do the same project for less money, he may find that the lesser reward crowds-out his desire to do the project. In my example of the NALAC grant I show this very instance. By contrast, Jaclyn's 50 percent budget reduction in the BREAD budget crowded-in her motivation to continue, because the commission represented a moment of having "arrived" the cultural landscape of Austin.

Crowding theory emerges from a "rational choice framework," which combines economics and the social sciences, including psychology:

> [T]he new kind of inter-disciplinarity proposed here is based on a unique analytical method (the economic way of thinking), which has been used to study a large variety of problems and issues. The model of human behavior applied here carefully distinguishes preferences, i.e. what people desire, and constraints imposed by social institutions, income, prices and the amount of time available. It has been successful in accounting for phenomena in and beyond economics. (Frey 1)

By applying crowding theory to artists, Frey attempts to counter an emphasis on monetary rewards in neoclassical economics. Neoclassical economics presumes that artists are motivated first and foremost by adequate external rewards. And yet, as Frey points out, artists balance a number of intrinsic forces, creativity, pleasure, care, even the anger that may inspire an artist to make a piece about war, or wealth and poverty, or

identity. “Rewards-based” systems among artists must negotiate the complex systems of internal reward (Frey and Osterloh 21).

Throughout this dissertation, I have applied complex definitions of capital by including at various times social, cultural, and intellectual capital. Bourdieu saw the relationships of individuals and groups to society as informed by social and cultural capital (“Forms of Capital” 241-244). I have used intellectual capital to refer to the relationship of performers to the discourses of the academy. Intellectual capital comes into play when the work of performers is studied for its aesthetic as well as what it says. Frey does not make distinctions between different types of capital or how they might have a controlling or informing stake by their effect on one’s internal motivations. Traditionally, economists have only addressed three other types of capital: “physical capital, human capital, and natural capital.” Physical capital comes in the form of goods. Natural capital is nature. Human capital is human labor. In 1999, economist David Throsby proposed the economic use of cultural capital to describe “the stock of cultural value embodied in an asset” (“Cultural Capital” 6). For Throsby, “tangible” forms of cultural capital include sites of cultural heritage, in-kind services. Intangible cultural capital includes the “set of ideas, practices, beliefs, traditions, and values that serve to bind together a particular group of people” (7). Throsby’s intangible forms reflect the internalized symbolic values (or “assets”) expressed in Frey’s crowding theory. In adapting crowding theory to describe motivation and support, I have chosen to use different forms of capital to express extrinsic factors. Immaterial forms of capital illuminate the reasons behind process. Validation from colleagues may be an adequate external reward to an artist making new work or participating in a performance.

Similarly, my applied definition of crowding theory helps explain the processes of support that exist in the lives of independent artists. The theory also provides a helpful

rubric for examining the motivations and tensions that attend the lives of my performance colleagues in San Antonio. Crowding theory helps examine my impulse to design the Latino Performance Initiative in June 2005, and it uncovers the reasons why the Latino Performance Initiative did not eventually happen.

FOUR ARTISTS IN SAN ANTONIO

In May 2005 I called José Rubén De León and told him that I wanted to speak with him, Amalia Ortiz, and María Ibarra about their careers. I wanted to speak to all three artists because we are all Mexican-American independent performing artists who live in San Antonio and who tour. In general, I wanted to consider how region, identity, and experience have played a role in our work. San Antonio is the ninth largest city in the nation. Its population is largely Mexican-American; however, as Flores has argued, Mexican/Americans have been geographically and socially dislocated from the lands and lives of our forbearers, since Texas was carved from Mexico (*Remembering* 1-7). I experience San Antonio as a site of conflict and a site of hope for increased presence among Latino/as. I wanted our voices present in my study.

De León responded to my query that he was glad for the opportunity to gather, because all of them graduated from the theater program at the University of the Incarnate Word in San Antonio and he had always wanted to ask them about their experiences. Ibarra and Ortiz are colleagues and friends, both in their late 20s, who graduated within a year of each other; De León graduated a few years ahead of them. I was surprised at this bit of serendipity.[76]

---

[76] María A. Ibarra is an actor, writer, director, activist, and teacher. With Eli Rios, she co-founded madmedia, a video performance, music, spoken word, and visual art collective for which she has co-produced, acted in, and/or directed nine productions, including *Lucha Lenguas*, *Jotos del Barrio*, *Pocho/a* and *Women of ILL Repute: Refute!* She teaches the Jump-Start Performance Co. education program and is

In hindsight, I realize that support had been the subtext of our interactions that spring and the impetus for my call. Some months before, I had called all three artists and reminded them to apply for the Creative Capital artist fellowship grant. In May, I encouraged them to apply to the National Association for Latino Arts and Culture (NALAC) grant. My actions were political. As I explain in my next chapter, the majority of Creative Capital Foundation grantees have been New York and California artists (Atlas et. al, 31-35). The NALAC award came from a Ford Foundation Fellowship, and I wanted San Antonio artists to be part of the representative applicant pool (Ford Foundation, "Grant Information"). In addition, Ibarra, Ortiz, and I were all working in Jump-Start's education program in inner city schools, and so we were regularly sharing lesson plans, sharing classroom space, or even combining classes and sharing teaching duties. De León and I had been speaking frequently about his presenters and possible tour dates ever since the National Performance Network Annual Meeting in December 2004.

I had also originally identified these three other artists because all four of us had been working on new performance works. I had just closed a run of *Fringe and Fringe Ability*, a show I premiered in workshop at Jump-Start in July 2004, and re-premiered

---

the director of Grupo Animo, a youth theater project of the Guadalupe Cultural Arts Center, a prominent Chicano/a cultural center in San Antonio.

Amalia Ortiz represented San Antonio at the National Poetry Slam in 2000 and was the first Latina to compete in the National Slam Finals. She has appeared on three seasons of *Russell Simmons Presents Def Poetry* on HBO and the 2003 NAACP Image Awards on FOX TV. Ortiz currently tours with the female performance-poetry troupe Diva Diction, The Chicano Messengers of Spoken Word, and the Def Poetry College Tour. Currently,she works in the education department of the San Antonio Children's Museum.

Since 1992, José Rubén De León has created solo performance, beginning with two spiritual dramas, *Mark's Gospel: A Drama of Hope* and *St. Francis of Assisi: A Musical.* In 2002, he premiered *El Encuentro/The Encounter: Juan Diego and the Virgen de Guadalupe*. In 2003, he premiered *Lorca*, based on the life and works of Spanish poet Federico García Lorca. In 2004, he created the concert version of *Simplemente Lara.* He is also an independent recording artist who distributes his own work. His CDs include a series of original love songs, *On Borrowed Time*, a traditional Indian chant, *Bengali Lullaby*, 13 Andalusian folk songs, *Colección de Canciones Poplares Antiguas*. Currently, De León tours full-time as an artist.

(with an additional actor) in February 2005. Ibarra had been presenting excerpts from her new show in-progress (which she later named *Maldiciones de Milagros [Curses of Miracle]* for our grant) at the Jump-Start works-in-progress series, W.I.P. Ortiz had just premiered *Otra Esa on the Public Transit* at Talento Bilengue in Houston, which Ibarra directed. That May, De León was rehearsing *Simplemente Lara* for a second-run at Jump-Start. *Simplemente Lara* is a concert of Lara songs arranged and performed by De León, which he premiered at Jump-Start in March 2005. De León had been using the concert format to develop material for a full-length show which he would eventually call *Lara*.

Ortiz, De León and Ibarra began the discussion by telling me about their college experience at the University of the Incarnate Word (UIW), where they did not feel supported in their desire to pursue careers as performers. Ortiz said that she was encouraged by the faculty to pursue a career in "technical theater" because she did not have the "soap opera good looks" the faculty preferred and "because there's always going to be work in technical theater." Both mentioned that they were not encouraged to work as designers, but instead as tradespersons, set and costume builders and stage managers (De León, Ibarra, Ortiz, Personal Interview).

I asked if the decisions were racialized. Ortiz replied, "No there was this tall Latino actor who had soap opera good looks and he was cast all the time. Now he's a regular on [the ABC television show] *Desperate Housewives* [where he plays a reformed drug dealer]. All the people who were good looking were encouraged to go get MFAs."

Aside from an appearance as Tiny Tim, which she got as a result of being "the shortest in the department," Ortiz was encouraged to work as a costumer. Twice she was cast in a show, but her casting was denied by the faculty because she was needed to help the costume designer make costumes. Since graduating, she has pursued numerous

performance opportunities. Briefly, she took a job as administrator at the Guadalupe Cultural Arts Center before quitting to tour with Def Poetry Jam in 2003.

According to María Ibarra, during her school years, she played only two roles, which she identified as "the messenger and the housekeeper." Encouraged like Ortiz to pursue technical theater, she worked in the scene shop and stage managed. Her "first paying gig" as a performer and director was in *Pocho/a*, a show she co-created and directed with her former partner, Eli Rios.

De León told us about an audition that compelled him to redefine his role in the theater:

> I was at an audition for *Tartuffe*, and [the Chair of the Department] was directing. I was working full-time at UPS as a Spanish speaking telemarketer at the time, and going to school, and I was very tired. [During the audition,] I said the word "been" like "bean" and everyone laughed. [The director] actually fell out of her chair. I thought, "How can she treat me like this?" It was the first time I felt ashamed for being a [native] Spanish speaker. I just dropped the book and walked out of the theater. I went right to Half-Price Books to calm down, and I found this [Federico Garcia] Lorca book. I thought, "I'll do my own show about Lorca." (De León, Ibarra, Ortiz, Personal Interview)

Shortly after his *Tartuffe* audition, De León shared his audition story with another faculty member who suggested he channel his anger "into something positive" by memorizing and performing the Gospel of Mark for a religious conference. *The Gospel of Mark*,

which he premiered in 1992, inaugurated his career as a solo performer (De León, Ibarra, Ortiz, Personal Interview). He did not return to his plans for *Lorca* for another decade.

The stories of these three artists inspired me to think of how the performance space becomes a place of self actualization for its artist-producers. The external invalidation of their performance abilities, which all three prized, effectively crowded out their desire to pursue traditional theater careers. Instead, they crafted out independent careers, where they could produce work that held a high symbolic significance to them. De León has created shows that responded to his faith and to his appreciation of both Lorca and Lara. Ortiz has written poetry about social issues, such as the hundreds of women who have been killed in Ciudad Juarez, Mexico over the last five years. Ibarra continues to explore issues about Chicano/a identity and experience through her madmedia productions. These symbolic meanings suggested why they continued to support and find support for their work as artists.

Because their productions mean so much to them, they said, they were often willing to work for negotiable fees. Ortiz said that appearances through Def Poetry earn her about $1500 per week, but she does not worry about fees at home. She appears at "every poetry reading [she] can in San Antonio because [she wants] to feel connected to the community." De León said that his first fees came from passing the hat at the churches where he appeared, and the congregants often showed up with gift offerings, such as cakes, and so he was accustomed to asking what his presenters could pay. Ibarra said that madmedia works as a collective and splits all proceeds. The most she had made was $800 for four shows over a week split between San Jose and San Diego. Prior to that the most she had made for a touring show was "about $150" (De León, Ibarra, Ortiz, Personal Interview).

Despite, or more appropriately, because of the conditions they faced in college, Ortiz and De León expressed a desire to return to UIW to talk about their work. Both said that they were willing to speak for free. Similarly, Ibarra said she felt her greatest pleasure when speaking to students from UIW who attended her performance one night. Their presence validated her, as if the recognition that could flow through the theater program or its students amounted to a symbolic redress—in effect, their external validations informed, or crowded-in her own drive and made her feel supported in continuing. Likewise, Ortiz and De León wanted the internal validation, a crowding-in of approbation. Neither had been invite to speak to students at UIW (De León, Ortiz, Ibarra, Personal Interview).

Ortiz told a story that revealed how her own determination and focus had wavered when she considered her material circumstances against those of her classmates:

> María and I went to a wedding of a college classmate last week. There were these classmates with degrees and mainstream careers, and I had to walk away at one point and find María and say, "They're talking about careers – do we have a career?" It's funny because we've made this commitment to a career in the arts, and it's not the same thing. It's not like we have five-year plans, like the average teacher, or that we think of [our] retirement, and I felt I had to walk away because it's not like the same thing. I had to find María. (De León, Ibarra, Ortiz, "Personal Interview")

I failed to ask Ortiz for clarification about the "long-term planning" comment, but it occurred to me when listening to the tape of our conversation that she was responding to the regularity of income and work that marks a teacher's profession. In her comment, Ortiz made a distinction between her own and other professions, based on the assumption

that the other careers had built-in mechanisms for long-range planning and support. Her ambivalence emerged when she compared her own circumstances to her perceptions of theirs. She assumed that support was a fundamental part of their work, rather than a structurally-amenable one to someone with a regular salary.

Retirement, savings, and insurance are all part of the "and everything else" that independent businesspeople must attend to in the United States. Such long-term support exceeds the bounds of the eight mechanisms of support for artwork listed earlier in this chapter. These mechanisms are recognized as artists' much-needed "material supports" in *Investing in Creativity* (29-55). With social security under threat and the National Health Plan of the Clinton Administration a thing of the past, social supports remain an individual proposition among independent artists (Nunberg, "Commentary"). Working independently, artists can face a variety of constraints that make it difficult to maintain their basic social needs.

Ortiz said that in the summer before, she had failed to find a booking between late July and early September. She had not found other work because she spent much of May, June and early July working on a new show with The Chicano Messengers. By August, she said, she was "handwashing laundry in the sink and not having money for bus fare" (De León, Ibarra, Ortiz, Personal Interview).

Knowing that Ortiz had garnered national acclaim as a slam poet, I asked if anyone at the wedding had seen her work. She replied, "This one friend who has a Masters in English said that she will probably be studying my work one day." In our conversation, Ortiz would return to this response saying that she wanted to publish her work, so that it was more available to universities. Through publishing, Ortiz hoped to set up a system of supports that crowded-in her ongoing work. My interactions with Ortiz and Ibarra made me think how these artists, like many I have read about, defined

support and income as material concerns and emotional ones, which are summed up as "validation" in *Investing in Creativity* (Jackson et al. 5).

For a time, Ortiz worked as an Events Manager at the Guadalupe Cultural Arts Center (GCAC), a prominent arts organization on the west side of San Antonio. There she had health benefits and a regular income. After she won the National Poetry Slam in 2002, two artists who held positions at Guadalupe offered her advice:

> They took me aside and said that if I'm going to be an artist, I should be careful not to get too much into the nonprofit administration, because then I would get addicted to the paycheck. They encouraged me to get out. I had to anyway, because my work schedule and my performance schedule were conflicting. I'm trained in one field, but the one place I can't hold a job is an arts nonprofit because that conflicts with what I do. (De León, Ibarra, Ortiz, Personal Interview)

The two artists who took Ortiz aside are both accomplished artists. One is a director who runs a theater nonprofit in Houston. The other is a photographer whose work has won major international rewards; she is also the chair of the Visual Arts Department at a local University. Consequently, their advice appeared to follow a "do as I say, not as I do" model.

At the time, I struggled with my own response to this anecdote. My readings in cultural economics had me convinced that most individuals facing life as independent artists must be prepared to maintain additional, "humdrum" labor. Artistic jobs are often held as second jobs, which the artist then uses to subsidize labor. In this nation, the conditions for second job labor vary according to discipline, region, gender, race, type of work and need. On the whole, performing artists have the second highest rate of multiple

jobholding (Alper and Wassall 4-6).[77] The number of arts-related second jobs declined drastically in the period marked by the cultural wars, from 60 percent in 1985, to around 30 percent a decade later (44). Much of this drop was tied to the decline of support for arts programs, not only among cultural organizations, but also in schools, where states had slashed education budgets (45). Consequently, Ortiz's work at the Guadalupe seemed ideal because it gave her access to the field through a prominent Latino/a organization.

As I read through the transcripts again, I realized that Ortiz was addressing how her work at the GCAC as the Theater Manager was not suited to her work, because she was often required to work on weekends, and the work conflicted with her gigs. Some cities are more hospitable for hiring artists. In San Antonio, jobs that accommodate the frequent travel habits of a touring artist are not as readily available. In New York artists can find a variety of jobs that accommodate flexibility. Performers have long taken diversified employment – including public relations, data entry, and administrative work – negotiating their jobs with the demands of art-making (Klaiman 4). In San Antonio, however, Ortiz's work and needs were unique to the work patterns of local organizations, even those from the cultural sector.

At the time of our conversation, Ortiz and I were working as teachers in Jump-Start's education program. Because of some travel conflicts that emerged for me in the spring 2005, I was encouraged by the Education Director, Steve Bailey, to resign during the last two months of class. I had some other projects going that spring, and a substitute teacher was well-received by the students, so the switch seemed logical at the time. Ortiz said that she had not been rehired because of some touring conflicts she had during the same year. The conflicts had been more frequent than Ortiz had anticipated, because she

[77] Performing artists are second to "authors, post-secondary school art teachers, and artists not elsewhere classified" (Alper and Wassall 35).

was called to replace a poet who remained ill throughout the spring. Because the performance gigs paid $1,500 each and contributed to her ongoing appearances with the Def Poetry Jam College Tour, Ortiz felt motivated to take the jobs. The education job paid roughly $180 per week. With Bailey, Ortiz argued that she had arranged for substitutes, provided comprehensive plans, and created several powerful poetry projects. She was given a substitute position this year (Ortiz, Telephone Interview). I saw a missed opportunity for artist advocacy. Had we traded our stories about leaving the program sooner, we might have approached Jump-Start about its practice with respect to its mission as an organization that supports artists.[78]

Currently, Ortiz works as a Public Relations Specialist at the San Antonio Children's Museum. She said that when she got the job, she informed her supervisor that she would be traveling frequently. However, the staff members had grown tired of her schedule, and Ortiz feared that she would soon be released when she started a three-week tour in mid-May (Ortiz, Telephone Interview).

In 2005, De León told us that he was able to maintain the balance of art work and support through a massage practice and his CD sales. After college, he worked briefly at United Parcel Service before becoming a music minister at St. Mary's University in San Antonio for five years. During that time, he recorded his first CD of original compositions, a tribute to his mother who had recently died. In 1997, he opened his private practice. De León mentioned a schedule that he felt supported his work: "I work in the studio on Monday. I write on Tuesday. I massage Wednesday through Saturday. I rest on Sunday." As someone who is not so ordered, I found it hard to imagine that level

[78] In a subsequent interview with Bailey, I discovered that Ortiz's problems also stemmed from her failure to complete paperwork required for the state-sponsored program in which she taught (Bailey, *Interview*). Consequently, my own presumption of needing to advocate to Bailey was proven wrong. Rather, a dialogue examining the needs and expectations of the organization and the artist would may have merited a better outcome.

of regularity in my own life, but I appreciated it in his. For his projects, he said, he hired directors and musicians. His shows required orchestrations and accompanists. His partner is an arts administrator, who serves as the production manager for his shows (De León, Ibarra, Ortiz, Personal Interview).

Since our interview, De León has left his massage practice. Now tours his shows full time. Much like his work in churches, he has begun to identify and cultivate relationships with small community spaces throughout the Rio Grande Valley of Texas where his work has been well-received. Often he negotiates fees with presenters and splits box-office proceeds. He has also toured recently to Denver and San José. De León claims that he plans to continue touring for as long as he can. For now, he feels motivated to find new spaces of support for his work.

During our conversation in May 2005, Ibarra told us that she often grew tired from juggling her many jobs and performance work: "Can I work this hard in ten years?" she asked. She spoke of concerns over her health and the well-being of her son (De León, Ibarra, Ortiz, Personal Interview). During her senior year in college in 1998, Ibarra was diagnosed with lymphoma and had to undergo chemotherapy. In 2000, six months after the birth of her son, Solstice, she relapsed. Since then, she and her partner had separated, and she had primary custody of their child. Her former partner's health insurance covers her son, but because all of her work comes from contract labor, she relies on CareLink, a public health assistance program operated for the City of San Antonio by the University of Texas Health-Science Center. She was teaching in two arts-in-education programs, pursuing directing work, and developing her show (Telephone Interview). Ibarra's story is a potent reminder of the risks we face as independent artists, and the fact that the risks faced by some were great.

Since our interview, Ibarrra has experienced some changes that make questions of support rather urgent. The Guadalupe Cultural Arts Center (GCAC), where Ortiz once worked and where Ibarra has worked with Grupo Animo for five years, has undergone its third major reorganization since 2000 (Renaud-Gonzales, "Las True Stories"). The GCAC was founded in 1980 as a multi-disciplinary arts organization. It is the largest "Chicano/a cultural community-based organization in the United States, and yet it is in crisis (GCAC, "About Us").[79] The budget has been drastically reduced and the Board is at odds with the community. Money earmarked for programming and operations is alleged to have been diverted to the building of a new art gallery and a commercial space. The organization has tried to pass on the losses to its community, which is largely poor, by raising tuition for parents (Renaud-Gonzalez, "Las True Stories"). Ibarra was told there is "some money" for her programs, but very little. She would be paid to teach some classes, but she would not be paid to direct the Grupo's shows. Ibarra said that she was writing grants with the Theater Director, Marisela Barrera. Ibarra also planned to attend a Board meeting to talk to the board about the crises. Ibarra estimates that over the last two years, her directing income from Grupo Animo amounted to 30 percent of her annual income. She has begun taking other directing jobs. She is currently adapting and directing a show based on the poetry and prose of Ana de Luna. She had booked the show at the University of Texas in San Antonio, for which the production would be paid $1,000; however, she was going to donate that back to the production for an opening at the Guadalupe in the summer. She was also planning to continue working with the youth of Grupo Animo and to direct shows for a nominal fee of $200 (Telephone Interview).

[79] GCAC is a major cultural space in crisis. Its annual budget is 1.5 million. According to Felix Padron, the head of San Antonio's Office of Cultural Affairs, the organization received $450,000 for operating costs from the city of San Antonio in last year; nevertheless, the organization has laid-off 40 percent of its staff (qtd. in Renaud-Gonzales, "Las True Stories"). Barbara Renaud-Gonzalez, a freelance journalist who has been covering the story through her blog, "Las True Stories," speculates that the money has been used to shore up the GCAC's debt from its capital expenditures on building renovations.

A March 24, 2006 San Antonio Express-News story recounts Ibarra's appearance at the board meeting:

> María Ibarra, who has taught theater at the center, began by asking three board members seated at a long table so they faced away from the crowd of about 30 to "take a moment and look at all the faces that are here out of courtesy, out of respect, so you know your community. It's a community arts center [. . .]. Where are the arts? Why is this theater empty? Why isn't anything happening? Why doesn't the community just walk in like they once used to? Why do I have parents who can't afford to bring their children to the classes any longer? What can we do?" (Silva, "Guadalupe Center")

Ibarra's comments, combined with her plans, makes clear that the GCAC holds significance in her life as an individual and as part of a community. The small amount of financial capital and the greater amounts of cultural capital vested in the community motivated her to continue her work with the Guadalupe. Ibarra's comment asking the board to look at her reminded me of her experiences at the University of the Incarnate Word. She asked to be recognized not only for her presence, but as part of a greater community that supports and receives support from the GCAC.

As I looked at support, how it worked in my life and the lives of fellow artists, I realized that support came largely from the feeling of "putting all together" that I first learned onstage. Mechanisms of such presence motivated my career when they crowded-in the expressive desires I already had. When I saw a good performance and felt a part of a community that is making excellent art work, I feel encouraged to go forward. Even my feelings of competition—the "I want to do something that good" feelings—came

from an appreciation of the work I had seen and a desire to participate. The performer's example crowded-in my desire to perform. When I didn't feel honored, often I refused to give up, but continued to work for increased presence and appreciation from spectators or funders alike. Or, if I did give up for a moment, I would return after a period. The desire to work was that great. The sense of "putting it all together" emerged from a structure of feeling experienced as coalescence in my own project or among colleagues.

The recent accounts by De León, Ibarra, and Ortiz suggest that they are finding motivations to procure and offer support in their lives today. These systems of support avail themselves through the artists' disciplinary needs, as well as the uniqueness of the San Antonio area, where there is a supply of artists and cultural organizations, both thriving and in need. Ortiz struggles to balance a job and a touring life. Ibarra's continues to support the GCAC. Jose uses Rio Grande Valley networks to find new performance spaces. These experiences point to the ways that artists find and give support. To varying degrees, all three artists mediate their needs with those of the greater community.

Their ongoing efforts in procuring and sustaining a system of supports inspired me to create the LPI for NALAC's grant opportunity. Through my application process, I was able to theorize how to turn a product-oriented grant in to a process-oriented one. I was also able to see clearly how this process was received, and to consider how and when I can offer support.

THE NALAC GRANT

The National Associaiton of Latino Arts and Cultures (NALAC) began as a project of the Guadalupe Cultural Arts Center in San Antonio, TX in 1991. It has served as its own organization since 1995. The organization sees itself as a coordinating hub for

the expression of Latino/a cultures in the United States. The most regular program of NALAC is its annual conference, which is generally held in San Antonio. In 2004, NALAC received a one-year, $150,000 Ford Foundation award to administer a grant program for Latino/a artists (Ford Foundation "Grant"). The terms of the grant were common to the original formula espoused by the Ford Foundation—project grant recipients were required to earn or raise 100 percent of the amount granted from NALAC.

During our conversation in May 2005, I asked Ibarra, De León, and Ortiz, if they had applied to Creative Capital Foundation's Individual Artist Fellowship program, which I examine in the next chapter, or if they planned to apply to the upcoming grant program for Latino/a artists administered by the National Association of Latino Arts and Cultures. Ibarra said she has started the Creative Capital grant on a friend's computer and had neglected to save it right away. When her son tripped on the power cord, the computer turned off, and she lost her document. Because she was within hours of having to submit the letter of intent, she gave up. Her story was a clear account of how events in artists' daily lives can affect creative plans and processes. Ortiz said, "I looked at the deadlines, and [the grant writing] conflicted with the script-writing time I needed." Ortiz was motivated to participate in a more direct means of acquiring support. De León stated he had found both too complex. When I asked if they would apply to NALAC, Ibarra said:

> You know that year in Junior High when we were really supposed to learn writing? We couldn't keep an English teacher at my school. They never lasted more than a week or two. I still think I don't know how to write, and so it takes me a long time to write anything like that. I'm sure it's wrong. (De León et al. Interview)

Ibarra related a sense of despair and absence in the grant-writing process. To Ibarra, the grant represented an abstraction, an unlikely possibility. Its material value was remote; its symbolic value to her was smaller than its symbolic threat (of potential failure). The period of her entry into the arts was marked with the strife of decreasing funding opportunities.

I asked De León to explain what he meant by complex. He said that he felt troubled by the matching funds required. He explained that he had raised $2,000 for a theater that signed on as a co-commissioner for his previous show, *Lorca*, and that the fundraising experience had been difficult. For the NPN commission, he got two NPN Partners, or member theaters, to sign on as co-commissioners and to provide $2,000 each. One of the two theaters asked him to help fundraise the $2,000 commitment. The $10,000 he received in return from the NPN helped him pay for the thirty individuals he hired for the show. With the NALAC application, he faced not only fundraising but writing a budget (De León, Ibarra, Ortiz, Personal Interview). I was surprised that he described this as a difficulty. The money he got in return was substantial, but De León made it clear that he preferred a smaller system of supports. Like Ortiz, he preferred to earn the money.

Looking around the office of Jump-Start, where we were meeting, I felt a sense of empathy. Competitive programs, like grants, bolstered me, but only when I won. When I lost out, I felt a lack of support and a lack of motivation to try writing again. I felt isolated. For me, the symbolic value of creating a collaborative model was greater than pursuing a grant for just myself. In what I see now as an attempt to sustain the structure of feeling around coalescence, I volunteered to create a NALAC application for all of us. They agreed, and I took on the work of conceptually crafting the grant and writing it.

Through my offer, I took a "we" proposition and turned it into an "I" action. My motives were selfish and generous, mediating the singular "I" with the plural "you"—my "cultural work of mercy" stood to benefit us both. I was compelled by the presence and stories of my colleagues to support their work. After three years in Austin for graduate coursework, I was glad to be back among them. I wanted to use some of the thinking and skills I had acquired in graduate coursework. I also wanted to support my own work, but my work was now three-fold, addressing both my locations as artist-producer and artist-scholar and artist-activist. Through the grant, I wanted to ask how the systems of support can address artist process as well as product.

At the time of our meeting, I had made it to the second round of Creative Capital's two-part granting process with a show I called *Off the Cuota*.[80] *Off the Cuota* was meant to be a travelogue taken from a journey through Mexico. The show would examine my experiences across the border in Mexico, among people with whom I share a common ancestry. The project was meant to capitalize on my 1999 show *Memory's Caretaker*, which examined my family's cultural assimilation. In *Off the Cuota*, I wanted to challenge myself to develop a bilingual show with video feed.

When I sat down to read and write the NALAC grant, I learned that the organization would allow individual artist fellowships. De León had been wrong about a match required, but by then I was invested in the idea of support and committed to the application for the group. The other artists were interested in participating in a group process.

I was given permission by the organization to apply as an individual group of unincorporated artists, essentially, to extend my "fellowship" to a group; however,

[80] A *cuota* is toll road highway. Free trade has made travel fairly easy in Mexico. *Cuotas* bypass towns. Off the cuota represented a journey into a town and off the trade route. I had hoped to develop the show if I received funds. I still hope to develop the show; however, the lack of funds and my own scholarly pursuits have prevented me from taking up the project currently.

considering the documentation that would be required for both NALAC and the internal revenue service, I decided to apply under the umbrella of a nonprofit. As a member of Jump-Start, I could take advantage of its sponsorship and include it in my production plans for the coming year.

The opening statement of the Latino/a Performance Initiative grant outlines a project that will bridge product with process (Table 1, "Narrative"):[81]

> The Latino/a Performance Initiative (LPI) is a four-person ensemble led by Paul Bonin-Rodriguez. LPI artists take a materialist approach to supporting performance. Over two years, we will 1) create new works, 2) observe, document and evaluate our processes, 3) write, publish, and hold forums about our work for other performers, scholars, and funders. ("Summarize")

These three steps were worked out through multiple processes. I asked for support to create the four new shows that each of us was developing: *Lara* (De León), *Otra Esa on the Public Transit* (Ortiz), *Maldiciones de Milagros* (Ibarra), and *Off the Cuota* (Bonin-Rodriguez). I listed each artist as the "artist-producer" of his/her work to signify the multiplicity of our tasks and the collaborative nature of our processes. In addition, I stated explicitly that we would serve as a collective during the making of the show and thereafter.

I secured a commitment from Jump-Start Performance Co., not only as fiscal sponsor, but as executive producer as well. The commitment came with two weeks of

[81] The name of the Latino Performance Initiative is a loaded signifier. The week of our meeting coincided with the national announcement that the Latino Theater Initiative, a ten-year program of the Mark Taper Forum in Los Angeles, would soon be ending (Morris 18). I had already heard about the cut from one of the participating artists, and so I gave the application a name that referred to the recent loss. I meant it as a signifier of shared struggle.

performance for each artist. Jump-Start budgets its weekly operational production expenses at $2000. The sponsorship was worth $16,000. In addition, I provided a 5 percent "umbrella fee" to pay Jump-Start for the administrative costs the organization would incur for LPI (Table 6).

For each show I developed a corresponding budget (Tables 2-5, *Lara*, *Otra*, *Maldiciones*, and *Cuota*), as well as a general overall budget (Table 6). I spoke with each artist about their needs. We established a uniform pay structure, but not uniform expenses. De León would require orchestration, studio production, and musicians, so his budget was higher (Table 2). Likewise, I budgeted for travel and video production so my expenses were higher (Table 5). The amount I requested from NALAC differed only slightly for each show, based on the total expenses. I "earned" some of the matching funds required through Jump-Start's contribution of $16,000, some through projected box office receipts, and some through grants.[82] I asked each artist to write one grant. I had already advanced to the second round of Creative Capital, but I asked De León, Ibarra, and Ortiz to apply to the Puffin Foundation, an organization that provides small grant amounts of $1,000 to $2,000 to emerging artists (Puffin, "About Us"). At an estimated $4,000, my prospective income from Creative Capital was higher than that of the other artists, and so I asked for only $2,400 to support my show, which was less than the other artists. However, I did ask for $3,000 for leadership fees.

The "leadership" fee troubled me. To a certain extent, it reflected what I had contributed. I spent one entire week working only on the grant. If the grant went through, I anticipated spending well in excess of 300 hours in project administration and leadership and negotiations with Jump-Start. I budgeted at a rate of $10 an hour, which

[82] In hindsight, I realize that the $16,000 was actually an "in-kind" donation, since no funds were changing hands. My error is not mentioned in the Peer Panelists' final comments, and so I do not know if it was recorded (NALAC, Peer Panelist).

was not a high amount, but what I felt I could request given the size of the grant. I was concerned that if asked for $25 an hour, a fee much closer to an estimable market value, I would appear as if I were profiting unfairly at the expense of my colleagues and jeopardize the grant. Wanting the grant model to succeed, I lowered my amount. I did consider matching the $3,000 with an additional $3,000 in-kind, but I feared that would make a statement about giving the work away.[83]

Negotiating the fee, I experienced my own ambivalence to business and art and my fear that the "ask" was too much (Alexander 15). In an earlier draft of my grant proposal, my ambivalence was apparent in my defensiveness about asking for money. In the budget narrative, I wrote, "[L]ike any professional, manager or consultant, Paul will be compensated for his leadership in the project."[84] When I placed the narrative on the online form, it did not fit, and I was forced to make cuts. My final statement about my work was far more succinct and clear: "includes grant writing, administration, advisement, and reporting" (Table 1). My total "ask" was for $21,000.

In the last paragraph of the narrative, I was asked what I would do if the budget had to be reduced. I had worked hard to create the program and to secure commitments with Jump-Start, to gather the support materials, to keep the artists abreast of the process. The request represented my commitment of support for the artists and the field. Its symbolic value was high. The idea of a reduced amount was diminishing to me; it crowded out my motivation to go forward. In response I wrote:

> We encourage NALAC not to reduce the amount requested from our budget. Given Jump-Start's programming schedule (which will allow for two performers in 2005-06 and two more in 2006-07) and the breadth of

[83] Two weeks after submitting the NALAC grant, I submitted my final Creative Capital grant and estimated my fees at a rate of $25 an hour. My grant was rejected, and no comments were provided.

> this application, we do not feel that it can be accomplished in one year. Should the money requested be reduced, all artist and professional fees will be reduced incrementally and within reason. (Table 1)

My response to the organization's request that I consider reducing the budget felt like a pulling back of support. It hailed the recession of the patron state. It made the process feel disingenuous. At the same time, I recognized the request reflected the organization's limits and the need apparent among nonprofits. My response was also ambivalent. In the first half of the comment, I asserted the value of the project as it stood. In the second half of the passage, I reneged and said that I would reduce the fees.

In the Peer Panel comments I received from NALAC in April 2006, my final comments are read as far more strident: "In the application, they are encouraging NALAC not to reduce the amount they are requesting; does that mean that if we can't give them the whole amount; then they don't give us anything?" (NALAC Panel Comments; sic). The "give" reveals the anticipated quid pro quo nature of the grant process. It straddled the organization's own needs—referred to as "can't give"—with the artists' illogic, or entitlement—referred to as "don't give."

Throughout the comments, the organization refers to the project as not collaborative, but "four solo works that should have applied individually." In the comment, the organization queries the structure along very standard terms: solo works are for individuals; collaborations are only aesthetic in nature, not material; artists are organized by organizations. The process-oriented and collaborative, mutually-supportive aspects are overlooked, and competition is hailed:

---

[84] I maintain a file that includes early drafts of my NALAC application.

> Are they an organization? Is it sustainable? It would have been more interesting to see them apply as individual artists. Maybe they thought they'd have more power, if they applied together. Should at least have an advisory group (NALAC Panel Comments; sic).

The grant posits that we "thought" we would have power if we applied together. Taken with the other comments, the grant process becomes explicitly about competition. The notion of sustainability disregards the commitments and supports we received from Jump-Start, based on our combined social and cultural capital. More importantly, the comments reveal that the panel's inability to read collaboration as negotiable among artists without an intermediary organization or without forming an organization.

In the minutes that followed my grant submission, and the months that bridged the receipt of my rejection, I wondered whether I should have capitulated in those final moments of the budget narrative and said I would "reduce the funds incrementally" if the organization lowered the amount. I recognized that my request represented a significant percent of the organization's entire $150,000 budget, some of which was no doubt taken by administrative costs. If the panelists were aware of the amount available—in my experience, panelists often are aware of the amount available—then my comparatively sizable "ask" might have crowded-out their motivation to support the LPI. By asserting the inherent value of the program as budgeted, though, I could have supported in theory and practice, the recognition of real costs as projected. I would have asserted the value of program itself.

I tell my partner Hank that doing the LPI is not worth doing for less, if less represents gifting that over-commits me beyond what I can afford financially, physically, and emotionally, since my investment will be even heavier if I have to earn more money

to support it. I wish to be genuinely supportive, mediating my needs with those of others. By maintaining the balance of motivation, I can go forward in the many communities where I work, supporting myself, supporting others, supporting each other.

When I received the rejection in October 2005, I called all three artists and told them the news. They had copies of the grant. We had kept in touch since April, contacting each other with our various appearances and readings and opportunities. Each of them told me that they were glad to be a part of the process. The LPI offered us an opportunity a way to theorize and experience support.

In hindsight, I realize that my grant did focus on product. The panelist's comment about the project devolving into four solo shows was not solely a failure of reception, but also a failure of my presentation. I offered four new works as the "product" of the grant's support and asked the panel to imagine how four artists' mutual support would be worked out in practice. Had I wanted to challenge the grant model, I would have written more extensively about how we would be spending time together, how we would be influencing each other's processes, how we were planning to support each other. Had I done so, I would have turned the tables on a product-oriented grant and revealed our awareness of process, not only to the panel, but among the collaborators. As I conclude in my chapter on networking, the planning process is one in which we should actually see both necessary and available support in the making of a new work.

A more thorough interrogation of our processes would have found us really exposing our need for support and our actual availability to support each other. As with networks, support-focused interrogations can offer artists insights into the actual costs of their practices. More importantly, such interrogations can help us see how we function as a community of support.

Chapter Five: "Troubling 'Entrepreneur'"

"[T]he entrepreneur himself represents a higher level of social elaboration [. . .]: he must have a certain technical capacity, not only in the limited sphere of his activity and initiative but in other spheres as well [. . .]. He must be an organizer of masses of men; he must be an organizer of "confidence" of investors in his business, of the customers of his product, etc."

—Antonio Gramsci (*Prison Notebooks*, 1945).

"In the American system of cultural patronage, the arts administrator, whether in a public agency or a private, not-for-profit enterprise, has always had to be an entrepreneur: mediating the funding triad of earned income, philanthropic giving, and governmental subvention."

— Kevin V. Mulcahy ("Entrepreneurship of Cultural Darwinism?" 2003).

"Creative Capital was founded in 1999 to support innovative artists in all disciplines. From the beginning, we viewed artists as cultural entrepreneurs who deserve the financial support and advisory services that are available to entrepreneurs in other sectors."

— Creative Capital (*Funding Innovations,* 2003).

"Do we hear the word [entrepreneur] as commerce?"

— Ann Carlson (Fresh Terrain Symposium, 2003)

In this chapter, I interrogate the notions and opportunities that circulate around independent artist entrepreneurship. The semantic history of "entrepreneur" reveals a number of shifting meanings over the last century. As I show, the word has been used to describe a risk-taker, a leader, a capitalist, a gambler, and even a victim. By examining these uses, I show why "entrepreneur" holds certain ambivalence for independent artists, and, paradoxically, why it may hold some allure. My examination is informed by independent performing artists Peggy Shaw and Lois Weaver, who claimed and dismissed the term "entrepreneur" during our conversation in 2004, as well as a panel of artists who refused to use the term during a symposium held at the University of Texas in 2003.

In the second part of this chapter, I apply the definitions and implications of entrepreneur to an examination of the Creative Capital Foundation. Inaugurated in 1999 and now in its seventh granting cycle, Creative Capital supports artist entrepreneurship primarily through its fellowship program, "a four-part system" that includes direct project support, technical assistance, artists' community-building through retreats, and ongoing artist promotion (Lerner, "Letter to the Field" 2002). For artists who are not fellowship recipients, Creative Capital offers a "Professional Development Program" (PDP), which is available to artists in a few cities. From an institutional standpoint, Creative Capital's programming dialectically engages and challenges the product-oriented focus of many longstanding support grant programs. In doing so, it raises questions about traditional granting models and responds to cultural policy concerns highlighted in studies such as *Investing in Creativity*. Creative Capital's program expresses artist development as a value equal to that of artist product. Creative Capital offers training, validation, material rewards, and information to an elite network of artists (Jackson et al. 3-5). In doing so, the organization replicates models of capitalist competition. Through my examination, I demonstrate Creative Capital Foundation's limited use of the term "entrepreneur" and suggest programmatic changes that would reflect the collaborative nature of the performance field.

A VEXED WORD LINGERS

This dissertation was inspired by an argument over the word "entrepreneur" that took place during Fresh Terrain: A Performance Art/Theatre Festival and Symposium at the University of Texas in Austin in January 2003. During the Symposium, the festival's invited artists, scholars, critics, and other arts professionals spoke about their work and

the state of the field to each other and the students present. Divided into two groups, the festival's featured artists appeared in two panel sessions, both titled "Entrepreneurial Strategies."[85] According to the Fresh Terrain brochure, the goal of the panels was for artists to discuss "their evolution as creators and producers." The first group would speak "particularly with regard to their own artistic statements and the pragmatic strategies they've developed over the years to sustain their work." The second group would address "how they devise [performance] work, how they came to use this form, and the production strategies they use to make their way through the theatre/performance world" (Fresh Terrain, Brochure).

Fresh Terrain was co-produced by the Department of Theater and Dance and Mark Russell, then director of Performance Space (P.S.) 122, a prominent cultural center on Manhattan's lower east side. Over four days, seven full-length performances opened and ran in repertory. The shows included: the solo performance *Blanket* by Ann Carlson, a profound and simply embodied journey through one woman's life; one dance duet, *Secreto y Malibu* choreographed by Diana Szeinblum, an intense and visceral chronicle of the relationship between two women; one multi-character, multi-media work, *Shelf Life* by the Big Art Group, a visually complex and humorous rumination on consumption and waste; and a spoken word performance, *'Slanguage* by the Universes ensemble, a forum for urban-based, hip-hop identity language, movement, and music representation. Three full-length plays were presented: *Drummer Wanted* by Richard Maxwell, a starkly delivered mother-son story; *In On It* by Daniel MacIvor of dada kamera, a complicated tragi-comedy about love and loss between two men; and *Requiem for Tesla*, a rock biography about the inventor of wireless communications, written by Kirk Lynn of Austin's Rude Mechanicals. The program was taken at great risk by the department.

[85] The sessions are both titled "Entrepreneurial Strategies"; however, as I make clear, both sections are described differently.

Fresh Terrain embodied what historian Sally Banes has identified the academy's ambitious and longstanding support for alternative and avant-garde performance in the United States (219).

The department hosted a number of individuals whose work directly affects independent performing artists. The visitors included Creative Capital Foundation C.E.O./President Ruby Lerner, National Performance Network C.E.O./President, M.K. Wegman, *Village Voice* critic Alisa Solomon, Foundry Theater Artistic Director Melanie Joseph, my own colleagues from Jump-Start, then-Executive Director Steve Bailey and current Co-Artistic Director S.T. Shimi, along with a number of writers, scholars, and dramaturgs, including our own faculty.

I felt privileged to see the artists' work and to hear them speak about their processes both individually and as a community created by the festival.[86] My personal knowledge of the artists was limited. I knew the members of the Rude Mechanicals. I knew about Ann Carlson's work and something of her approach to the field, because I had served as a peer panelist the summer before for the Association of Performing Arts Presenters' Arts Partners program. The panel awarded Carlson and her collaborator and life partner, Mary Ellen Strom, $100,000 for *Geyser Land. Geyser Land* was a site-specific performance and video installation that took place on a railroad line in the mountains of Carlson's native Montana in the summer of 2004.[87] With my brochure in hand, I was especially interested in hearing how all the artists thought of themselves as

[86] I felt some competition, too. I was told by more than one festival organizer that I had been considered as a possible artist, only to have my participation denied by the Richard Isaackes, the department chair. In person, Isaackes voluntarily confirmed the story. He told me that the department could not pay students as professionals. His response conveniently disregarded the fact that two of the Rude Mechanicals, Kirk Lynn and Madge Darlington, were graduate students in the department at the time. In truth, I was so busy with coursework that I did not mind being overlooked.

[87] The panel awarded three grants that summer, including Elia Arce's Fruitvale Project. As a peer panelist for this organization, I signed a "confidentiality agreement" not to mention the proceedings. By mentioning the recipients and their amounts, I am only repeating what is publicly known.

"creators and producers," a term that sounds very much like "artist-producers." Right away, however, the panel's conversation got caught up in semantics of "entrepreneur."

"Do we hear the word [entrepreneur] as commerce?" Carlson raised the question to challenge her panel colleagues, which included Richard Maxwell, Daniel MacIvor, and Caden Manson and Jemma Nelson, both of the Big Art Group. Well into the panel's first hour, the artists had resisted moderator Joni Jones's suggestion that they address the "Entrepreneurial Strategies" title. Carlson's question gestured to the word "entrepreneur" as a loose signifier for which the panelists shared little fixed or common meaning. The question attempted to locate entrepreneur as a commercial term.

Dutch economist and artist Hans Abbing uses the term "sacred status of art" to characterize how artists privilege other social and aesthetic values and resist consumer culture (39). The idea of the artists as removed from commerce hails back to the Romantic era, when people believed that individual freedom and subjective imagination brought forth an essential truth in art. Romantic era artists idolized the genius and the hero, focusing on one's passion and inner struggle. Commerce, an extrinsic motivation, was thought to poison art's purity (26).

As I argue in my chapter on need, the tendency for artists to dismiss commerce in their work is also related to the recent history of patronage in the United States. Commerce does not recognize the bonds of mutual need that have existed between artists and nonprofits since the Ford Era of grant development in the 1950s. Many of the artists still took advantage of nonprofit instruments such as grants and fellowships. By addressing their work as commerce, the artists would have overlooked bonds that still exist between them and their supporters. Carlson is a former NEA fellow (Fresh Terrain, Program). Maxwell is former Creative Capital Fellow (Creative Capital, "Fellows"). Because they work so frequently in nonprofit structures, the commercial appeal of their

work is dubious. The artists may have feared that their association with commerce would subject them to scrutiny against the discourses of artist entitlement that have marked the past twenty years of cultural support. On a more contemporary level, the artists might have resisted the term commerce and the term "entrepreneur," because it represented something new and unfamiliar in their practice.

MacIvor attempted to answer Carlson's question by offering this tidbit about his professional strategy: "My P.R. is the show." His response intimated that the successful reception of one show created more opportunities for future work. The comment failed to rouse the other panelists to speak and begged the question, did they all hear the word "entrepreneur" as commerce? Was/is artist commerce so bad?

I first began to notice the word's use in my own field in 1999. In April that year, while performing a workshop version of *Memory's Caretaker* at Joe's Pub at the Public Theater in New York, I was invited by filmmaker Darryl Chin to come to the Andy Warhol Foundation offices to meet with Creative Capital executive director Ruby Lerner. I don't recall how Chin obtained my cell phone number, only that I was surprised to get the call. I was warmly greeted by both and asked to help gather artists in San Antonio for a discussion about the development of the Creative Capital Foundation that summer. I was told that the organization was being created to fill a gap in independent artist funding left by the NEA, and that the organization hoped to apply business models to independent artists, in effect helping us become creative "entrepreneurs." The word continues to be used regularly in Creative Capital's documentation. With Lerner in attendance at Fresh Terrain and Maxwell a Creative Capital Fellow, I thought someone might address the word.

University of Texas professor Ann Daly—who refers to artist "entrepreneurship" as a site of hope for artists in "Beyond Richard Florida" (2005)—suggested that the

artists think of the word entrepreneur as describing "the impulse to do your own work." In the context of the session, her comment suggested entrepreneurship contributed to the intrinsic desire to make performance. Entrepreneurship helped channel production. Daly's comment did not leave out commerce, but it left room for other forms of motivation, such as validation, comradeship, community investment. It also opened the discussion to the ways in which intrinsic desires and external motivations work together when artists produce work (Frey 141). Despite the encouragement inherent in the query, the artists appeared conflicted about the "Entrepreneurial Strategies" title.

When Foundry Theater Artistic Director Melanie Joseph asked the panelists, "How do you live your lives?" their tone changed. The artists began to offer autobiographical details about their material practices. We learned that MacIvor built some shows on credit cards and that Carlson refused to do so. We learned that Maxwell felt his simple aesthetic was the direct result of his once meager income as an emerging playwright. We learned that Carlson had once cleaned houses for her income, that she had to learn not to apologize for the ambition of her ideas, and that she once made $80,000 in a single year, but that she made "about half of that" most years. MacIvor stated that his company, dada kamera, worked according to an organizational five-year plan. Maxwell stated that he made only short-term plans. We learned that Jemma Nelson had recently lost his second job and that Caden Manson did not have a second job, but we learned little else from either. We learned each artist's age. Carlson was the oldest, followed by MacIvor, Maxwell, and then the mostly silent Nelson and Manson, respectively. Having been given the option to approach their material practices through examples that may or may not have resonated with their spectators' understandings of entrepreneurship, most of the artists felt free to speak about their lives and to offer their

strategies anecdotally. Undefined, the word entrepreneur troubled the panelists. Once dismissed, they were willing to discuss their work.

Although the artists had clearly not intended it, they had offered us a teleological formula. The sum of their comments suggested that age begat experience which begat greater planning, a concrete artistic income, and ease with discussing material practices. In hindsight, I realize there were so many other factors: race, class, gender, sexuality, community, education, and region possibly all contributed to their successes along with experience. Of the six artists speaking, three were from New York (Carlson, Manson, Nelson), one from Chicago (Maxwell), and one from Toronto (MacIvor). Carlson collaborates with Strom, with whom I served on the NPN Steering Committee. Manson and Nelson were partners, and though young, had received a successful reception in New York (Fresh Terrain, Program). MacIvor referred to a close system of colleagues who support his work, as actors or dramaturgs. As the author of eleven published books of plays, MacIvor has accrued greater social and cultural capital achieved through a body of work.

The struggle I witnessed during the panel provoked me to consider what would have made the word "entrepreneur" more appealing to the artists and more evident to myself. I recognize that I generally conceive a business entrepreneur as an individual who is focused, solvent, and satisfied in the material world – someone I often fear I am not. The word often makes me think of someone who is more systematic and disciplined than me. My imagined business entrepreneur makes each project contribute to a revenue stream; she is awash in a flood of profits because her work fits in a world of commerce and consumption. When I think so narrowly of the business entrepreneur, I do not see her example as my opportunity. I do not recognize that all entrepreneurs take risks. Some risks pay off, others do not.

ENTREPRENEUR DEFINED

The word entrepreneur has long had significance for both cultural and business spheres alike, with the meaning varying over time and circumstance. The word is derived from the French infinitive, "entrepretende," which means "to undertake" and describes 1) "a director of a musical institution," 2) "a person who undertakes or controls a business enterprise and bears the risk of profit or loss," and 3) "a contractor who acts as an intermediary" (OED, qtd. in Mulcahy 165).

According to linguistic researcher and National Public Radio's *Fresh Air* commentator Geoffrey Nunberg, the word entrepreneur was first adapted to the English language to describe a theatrical promoter, equivalent to an Italian "impresario." Between the 1920s and 1950s, the word became affiliated with unsavory business practices, like someone who operated illegal gambling operations ("Commentary"). The word was rarely used in published discourse. A word search reveals only five entries for "entrepreneur" in *The New York Times* between 1865 and 1965 (n. 2).

During the Reagan presidency, conservative politicians and their supporters revived the word "capitalism" to take the place of the euphemistic "free market." Because "capitalist" still connoted the robber barons of the early twentieth century, they revived "entrepreneur" to fill-in for "capitalist." By the 1980s, "entrepreneurship" was taught in business schools. The entrepreneur was meant to describe the business-savvy citizen of the Reagan meritocracy that prized big business (Nunberg, "Commentary").

Today, the Bush administration regularly wields the word to put a positive spin on the number of people released from the social safety net of the corporate workforce. According to Nunberg:

> [T]he new use of 'entrepreneur' is part of a great leveling of the language of capitalism, which sweeps away the old distinctions between capital and labor–or at least the growing proportion of the labor force who are foregoing health coverage and a steady salary to make their own way in the world. ("Commentary")

Bush-era entrepreneurs put into relief the withdrawal of state support in the wake of the Reagan-era "culture wars." Since the conservative Republican climate is a legacy of the Reagan-era, contemporary entrepreneurs who are still struggling, or who are relying on public assistance, are still subject to the accusations of being lazy and at fault in the "intimate public sphere." Bush-era entrepreneurs sound very much like many independent performing artists, though not by choice. Given the conflicts of power, money, and survival inherent in the term's use in the United States, it is not surprising that artists would want to avoid it on political terms. The word entrepreneur is vexed by past associations and present struggles.

The second Fresh Terrain panel did not get bogged down in such semantics. As a group, the artists "Entrepreneurial Strategies" panel appeared more diverse. There were people of color—Mildred Rodriguez and Steven Sapp of Universes. Szeinblum was from Argentina and identified herself as Jewish. The Rude Mechanicals, who were represented by Lana Lesley, Kirk Lynn, Shawn Sides, Madge Darlington, and Sarah Richardson were all from Austin, rather than a major metropolitan area. Taking the lead from Darlington, who spoke freely about the joy of working as a collective to make work, the panel spoke more freely about collaboration and mutual reliance. Their stories were echoed by Sapp and Rodriguez's, who told us that they regularly gathered audiences by going out to communities, finding rappers, and sharing work. The artists on the second

panel addressed the term by illustrating their concepts of entrepreneurialism, which had to do with collaboration, outreach, community-building, and resource-sharing. The artists' forthrightness suggested that "entrepreneurship" could be dealt with if one maintained a fluid definition based on simple acts of connection among spectators and artists.

The struggle I witnessed over the word "entrepreneur" stayed with me as I considered my dissertation possibilities. I had been caught unaware of the word's trouble among artists. I wondered if the hesitation I had seen was exceptional. In the spring of 2003, I began reading through Creative Capital foundation's database of literature and noticed that the word was used frequently in its publications. I was curious to find out how other artists perceived the word.

My curiosity about the word accompanied me to the first interview I conducted. In spring 2005 I interviewed performance artists Peggy Shaw and Lois Weaver. I have known Peggy Shaw since we appeared on a double-bill in Hartford, CT, in 1996. I first corresponded with Lois Weaver through email in 1996, and we finally met in 1999 in London, where she teaches half the year. Peggy Shaw and Lois Weaver are independent performance artists who have created some of theater's most important feminist works over the past thirty years through their own company, Split Britches, through their contributions to New York's famed WOW Café, as well as through solo shows, teaching and directing (Dolan, "Performance" 464, 469).[88] Shaw and Weaver fit squarely within the OED definition of entrepreneurs. Individually and together they undertake their work at their own risk. Likewise, they frequently work as their own managerial intermediaries, employing lighting designers, videographers, costumers, choreographers, musicians, set designers, and directors. In the spring of 2005, the artists were completing a four-week

[88] See also Sue-Ellen Case's "Introduction" in *Split Britches: Lesbian Practice/Feminist Performance* (1-34).

residency at the University of Texas at Austin, during which they restaged one of Split Britches' early important works, *Dress Suits to Hire*, by Holly Hughes. I wanted to interview them because they had long careers, which now stretch across the Atlantic. Although our conversation covered the trajectory of their careers, their current material practices, and their concerns for the field, the conversation began with a concise unpacking of "entrepreneur":

> Weaver: I think we [independent performers] are all are entrepreneurs, but it insults me when the word is used, because I associate the word with business, and I also associate that word with Thatcherism and Reaganism, and that entrepreneurial sense of "Okay, if you're going to do it, you have to do it yourself, pull yourself up by your bootstraps." And yes, we've done that; we've always done that. We were entrepreneurs: we made our own companies; we made our own space to perform in; we made our own relationship to universities so we could work. We made our own business, but I don't like having that business term applied to artists, even though those are the principles I teach when I teach independent artists. I teach students to be independent artists; a huge part of that is being an entrepreneur.
>
> Shaw: But I never would use the word.
>
> Weaver: I never would use the word, no, because it feels so—
>
> Shaw: It's "independent"; that's the word.

Like the Fresh Terrain panelists, Shaw and Weaver were unsettled by the use of the word and sought to avoid it. Echoing Nunberg, Weaver identified the term with a certain politic and used the identification to rationalize dismissing it. Shaw accommodated Weaver's dismissal by echoing the more comfortable word that Weaver had already used, "independent." Both artists distanced themselves from the word "entrepreneur" on political principle while claiming its meaning as a reality of practice. As Abbing notes, "autonomy is relative" in the arts; artists are essentially collaborators who mediate aspects of work and practice (88). Shaw's and Weaver's subsequent conversation revealed them as independent artists who regularly serve as producers, or co-producers, for each project. As "artist-producers" they function as intermediaries and leaders in the ongoing work of many artists. Like the artists on the second "Entrepreneurial Strategies" panel at Fresh Terrain, Shaw and Weaver identified entrepreneurship as an act of collaboration.

In "Entrepreneurship or Cultural Darwinism?" sociologist Kevin Mulcahy attempts to revive the original use of the term when he refers to arts administrators as "cultural entrepreneurs who mediate the funding triad of earned income, philanthropic giving, and governmental subvention" (165). Mulcahy's project is to illustrate how the entrepreneurial role in the cultural sector has developed from its first uses as "impresario." Mulcahy locates the cultural entrepreneur between the state and the market. Like Barber, he believes that without the support of the state only the most commercially viable artists, media, and projects survive, a result he calls "cultural Darwinism" (173).

Mulcahy's entrepreneurs take a systematic approach to their work:

> *The Entrepreneur* sees fundraising as a means to further organizational goals. Working as an intermediary, the entrepreneurial leaders seek to

> mobilize symbolic rhetoric to forge broad coalitions of stakeholders ready to protect and promote the individual and societal values of the art and culture as well as their aesthetic integrity. (176)

Mulcahy's entrepreneur is something of an artist-producer in the "theater" of material practices. Entrepreneurs are collaborators by definition. They accomplish their work by gathering "broad coalitions" who value and promote society's appreciation of art.

Gramsci saw the "capitalist entrepreneur" as someone who functioned between labor and capital (Ehrenreich and Ehrenreich 11). The entrepreneur represented a group of individuals whose far-reaching influence was based in his relations:

> The entrepreneur himself represents a higher level of social elaboration [. . .]: he must have a certain technical capacity, not only in the limited sphere of his activity and initiative but in other spheres as well [. . .]. He must be an organizer of masses of men; he must be an organizer of "confidence" of investors in his business, of the customers of his product, etc. . . . [A]t least an elite amongst them must have the capacity to be an organizer of society in general, including all its complex organism of services, right up to the state organism, because of the need to create the conditions most favorable to the expansion of their own class. (Gramsci, *Prison* 5-6).[89]

[89] Writing from prison, where he was held for Marxist allegiances in Italy in 1933, Gramsci dodges censorship by using the term "fundamental social group" to denote a Marxist notion of class, and the term "class" to denote a group (5 n. 1). I have not argued for artists as a class, but a particular group, working variously through the discursive and material structures in the cultural sector. Gramsci's semantic clarification makes it possible for me to consider his notion of entrepreneur when addressing artist entrepreneurship.

By replacing the word "entrepreneur" in the quotation above with the words "artist-producer," I see a definition that is consonant with Mulcahy. As largely self-producers, independent performing artists create art and business prospects by organizing "masses"—a move which Gramsci also refers to as cultivating an "ensemble of relations" (8). Though independent, we are never autonomous. Our relations represent "broad coalitions" that contribute to individual products (or productions) as well as the vitality and structure of the meta-organization called the performance field (Mulcahy 176). We draw and build audiences (discrete "masses") through the "symbolic rhetoric" of our performance works and the material practices supporting them (176). Our processes inspire the confidence of presenters and granting organizations ("investors") alike. These investors, like audiences, are "stakeholders" (176). The successful presentation of one artist's work contributes to excitement in the field and the structures that maintain the field's existence.

In many ways, Shaw and Weaver's account of their career embodied and challenged Mulcahy's and Gramsci's definition of an entrepreneur. They are both artist-producers who serve as intermediaries to an ensemble of relations in production and reception. In production they work with a vast group of longtime collaborators. For many years they have built their careers both together and separately through a support base located in the academy, where they find their most sustainable work. Weaver indicated that their most fruitful work followed the publication of *Split Britches.* Shaw and Weaver's long careers contributed discursively to the "symbolic rhetoric" that justified their continued residencies. Shaw and Weaver's success in the academy and in theaters indicates the hierarchical network of the academy where artists who have access can continue to garner income. Universities offer financial, extrinsic incentives that complement internal, symbolic ones.

Weaver stated that both artists had a basic individual range of "$2,500 per week" per residency, but that Shaw was especially "good about asking and getting more" when it seemed the money was available. Had they continued to make that amount for 52 weeks of the year, they would each gross about $130,000 per year, far more than the $24,000 per year that the National Performance Network estimates as an artist income.

As if embarrassed by the disclosure, both artists quickly pointed out that the amount changes from project to project and that they do not work every week of the year. They also claimed that because that had not incorporated their company, Split Britches, into a nonprofit, their income is regularly drained from the expenses that result from their informal infrastructure, including the hiring of support staff, and the planning expenses, agreements built on "a lick, a kick, and a promise." Shaw contended that she was doubly-expensed at times, since she "had to pay taxes I used to pay other professionals." I countered that Shaw could fill out a 1099 for the person who provided "professional services." She shrugged, indicating that either she had not known or had chosen not to know.

Shaw and Weaver's practices were complex and unique to their accomplishments, habits, situation, and preferences. Shaw's response about taxes indicated that she used her "independent" status to justify working outside of the tax system. In doing so, she unwittingly reminded me that there were basic practices available to artists outside the nonprofit, tax-exempt system and that a basic awareness of these opportunities, or training, would benefit artists. Between their practices and my own, I realized that there was gap that held enough knowledge to counter misunderstandings, to take advantage of tax breaks, even to advance a significant discussion of a "livable wage." The "training" mentioned by *Investing in Creativity* should involve the innovative, hybrid for-profit and nonprofit approaches mentioned by Daly, but it should also include discussions about

competition, misunderstandings, even silence among artists with respect to certain practices, such as income. Shaw and Weaver's responses made me wonder what entrepreneurial skills hold back from discussing when teaching performance.

Like many independent artists and many Bush-era "entrepreneurs," Shaw and Weaver had limited health insurance coverage:

> Weaver: I have [British] National Health. I go to the doctor for free [in England]. I get meds for free; I have surgery for free. [But] the system is falling apart there, because of privatization. People are getting their own private insurance, so doctors are treating them, the fees are going up, and the socialized medicine is falling apart. Having said that, it still functions, it's still there. But emergency, that brings up other questions. If something were to happen to me, I would have to go to London, and that's not acceptable, because I feel like my home and family are here.
>
> Shaw: I've got Catastrophic [insurance coverage. A friend] talked me into it. I was going to be 60, how could I not have anything, so she had this thing. She said, "It costs $110 a month." It's for anything over $50,000. I don't know what it covers, but if I have to go into the hospital, I have a card. I'm not just in the gutter. So I have a card, and it says "Hospitalization," and they like that. So every three months, I pay $330. But I bargain with doctors. I have this doctor who charges me $45 for a visit. He's this gay guy and a friend. And when I've had to have operations, I've bargained with them, and they bring the fees down.

Shaw's story continued. She said that she had negotiated with a doctor to have the charges lowered when she had to have a lump in her breast removed. The doctor charged $1,000, rather than her usual fee of $3,000. The hospital charged its expenses of $6,000, which Shaw paid over time. Much like the account of their company's operations, they negotiated health with "a lick, a kick, and a promise." Shaw's story showed how negotiations kept her in a relatively vulnerable position: because she had no insurance, the hospital refused to admit her and only did so at the insistence of the surgeon. As Shaw's hospital story indicated, some of their risks were structural despite the abundance of their work. Some of their needs, such as health insurance, had been compensated for only in part. Other issues, such as tax crises, appeared avoidable. And yet the two artists continued to work as intermediaries, or entrepreneurs, shoring up needs with solutions.

Repeatedly, Shaw and Weaver asserted that they are "working class." They were no longer living hand-to-mouth, but they were not wealthy either. Repeatedly, they offered up their backgrounds as testimony to their class location. Shaw is from a working-class family in Boston. Weaver is from Appalachian Virginia. During Shaw and Weaver's visit to the University of Texas, performance critic Sue-Ellen Case lectured on Shaw and Weaver's work and described the artists as "migrant laborers": "They take this work because they need the money. It's a form of piece work" (Case, "Playing"). In the discussion after Case's speech and throughout our conversation, Weaver and Shaw stated they had called themselves migrant laborers "for the last ten or fifteen years." Although Shaw and Weaver resisted using the term entrepreneur for themselves, Case's assessment echoes Nunberg's linguistic definition of the word as work-for-hire. Taken in light of their many opportunities both availed and missed, Shaw and Weaver seemed to be wielding a symbolic rhetoric of themselves as ennobled "migrant laborers" that contributed to their work's ongoing appeal in the academy and beyond. While the

moniker had some relevance their actual practices, it also fetishized their work and concealed their level of access.

When I asked what they taught their students about starting out as performers, Weaver sounded like a risk-taking entrepreneur: "[I tell them don't] wait around for the right opportunity to get the work out. That's the thing. You don't have to wait for someone to give you something to make it work. Make it work; do anything you have to to make it happen." The implicit strategy in her message was that emerging artists should bombard potential presenters and spectators with new performance and learn from the responses offered. Weaver's testimony suggested that she taught her students to bring together supply and demand through resilience, faith, and commitment—what she summed up as "passion." The practice appeared to promote students playing risk-taking and intermediary entrepreneurs, even though the teachers resisted the term.

Shaw and Weaver's conversation held tight to romantic notions of artistry, even as their stories offered up both professional accomplishments and ongoing needs. In both Case's talk and their own interview, Shaw and Weaver's account of how they support themselves and their work alternated between themes of scarcity and abundance. At the same time, they frequently mentioned their role as intermediaries and organizers. These roles brought them more opportunities as well as expenses since they regularly paid collaborators. Their work did not appear easy. They recognized they were vulnerable to the market, to the state, and to potential crises that might emerge from their health or risks undertaken in making a new work. Still, they managed to find enough balance to continue their productive careers. Although they distanced themselves from the term "entrepreneur" on political grounds, "entrepreneur" often seemed appropriate for naming what they do and how they are perceived. Shaw and Weaver are leaders, risk-takers, intermediaries, and even individuals pursuing work-for-hire. By embracing the word's

nuances in their practices and teaching, they could provide a fluid definition and example for artist practice that gets beyond notions of artist need within bureaucratic systems of patron funding, that allows for "me and you" supports, and that reveals the roles played in the networks

The multiplicity of "entrepreneur" definitions available between artists and theorists suggests that the failure of the term's significance to independent performing artists is not one of meaning but use. As in the case of "need," independent performing artists can benefit from knowing a word's history and understanding the opportunities available in the term. The Fresh Terrain panelists resisted "entrepreneur" when the term was undefined. Carlson attempted to fix it with the word "commerce," but no one picked up on her cue. Shaw and Weaver resisted the term when it was used to validate to Reagan and Thatcher, but used it independent of those contexts to say "we are entrepreneurs." Had the artists recognized the complexity inherent in the words, they might have succinctly embodied the social location and practices of independent artists.

Between my meetings with Shaw and Weaver and my experiences in the Fresh Terrain panel, I saw three very prominent definitions of "entrepreneur" emerge. The first I call the "risk-taker." The risk-taker embodies Gramsci's idea of the "capitalist entrepreneur" and appears again in Nunberg's account of the "impresario" and "free market enthusiasts." On the Fresh Terrain panel, MacIvor embodied the risk-taker when he spoke of building his shows using credit cards. Shaw and Weaver revealed themselves as risk-takers in their work and their advocacy. Mulcahy points out that risk-takers do so with an eye on profit—be it financial profit or the warm acceptance of their work (175-176). In Laurie Carlos's words, these artists pursue "abundance."

The second definition I call the "intermediary." The intermediary is embodied by Mulcahy's account of the arts entrepreneur and Barber's account of the artist as a denizen

of the civic sphere. Intermediaries negotiate the exchange of benefits and expenses in the making of their work. All of the artists spoke of mediating their artistic vision with their material concerns. Shaw and Weaver spoke of their collaborations with institutions and with other artists. Maxwell spoke of material concerns mediating his aesthetic. Carlson spoke of not a using credit card, but monitoring income and expense so that she did not go into debt. Nelson, Manson, and MacIvor spoke briefly of working with companies and collaborators.

The third use is "ironic," which is a helpful analytical tool. Currently, this negative "entrepreneur" is a rhetorical abstraction for the failures of the Bush economy, but also a semantic guide to the analysis of those failures. Among artists, the ironic entrepreneur may address overly risky gamblers, perhaps those who build work on credit cards or without budgeting for actual income and expense. The ironic use is fluid, and thus, a call to awareness of present conditions and historical circumstances. The ironic entrepreneur emerged as "commerce" in Carlson's conversation, with commerce referring to a romantic notion of artists as ambivalent to "art as business" (Alexander 13).

I believe that all three definitions of "entrepreneur" used together can contribute to an artist's understanding of the ideologies hiding behind practice. The negative connotations refer to the discourses of need that have been wielded by and against artists during the last century especially. Such discourses remind artists that their work comes from balancing their own needs with those of their creative communities. The "intermediary" definition refers to the collaborative nature of performance. This definition refers to the many ways that "artist-producers" operate in a cultural ecology as partners. The "intermediary" role also refers to the level of organization required to maintain practice. Finally, the "risk-taker" definition refers to this moment of change in

the cultural sector, as artists embark on discovering new methods of support and practice through the vast and growing networks available.

The troubling of "entrepreneur" reveals how clearly words hold history and power for those who can wield the terms. As I show, the many definitions synonymously available are a wake-up call to artists to discuss their practices and social location in concrete terms. The semantic history of artist entrepreneurialism provides a space for artists to speak to each other and to resist being spoken for, as often happens when organizations take on the task of facilitating artist entrepreneurship. In the next section, I show how the Creative Capital Foundation uses the term to inform its practices with artists and how those practices invite interrogation.

THE CREATIVE CAPITAL FOUNDATION

The creation of the Creative Capital Foundation was inspired by perception of artist need and created to provide artists support. The Creative Capital Foundation was founded in 1999 in direct response to the budgetary cuts and programmatic restrictions imposed on the NEA in the 1990s. In many ways, Creative Capital's beginnings mirror the machinations behind *Investing in Creativity*. Twenty-four private foundations and individuals, including the Andy Warhol foundation, the Norton Family Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, Jeffrey Soros, nephew of billionaire financier George Soros, among others, joined forces to support the foundation's creation. The original funders gathered on behalf of philanthropy, politics, and enterprise. Through their coalition, they sought to promote experimental, even controversial work and counteract what they saw as threats to freedom of speech that had emerged during the "culture wars." By the time of its first-round grant announcement in 1999, the organization announced that it had

already raised assets of $5 million and had plans to accumulate $40 million over 20 years (Dobrzynski, "Private").[90]

At the time of its origin, Creative Capital recognized a performance field at a crossroads of immediate need and long-term support opportunities. Independent artists faced increasing challenges, including fewer theaters and presenters, fewer funds and opportunities for individual artists, and a problem of access to support for artists not living in the cultural centers of California and New York. For performers, the opportunities included increased internet capacity for distribution, greater acceptance for emerging fields and community-based theater forms (Atlas et al. 1, 7).

The "capital" in Creative Capital referred to "capitalists." Artists were seen as potential capitalist entrepreneurs who could, by producing social, cultural, and financial capital, counteract the diminishing patronage in the nation. Creative Capital promoted artists by applying venture capital concepts to their material practices:

> [These core ideas include] making a long-term commitment to a project; providing financial support beyond the initial award, assuming benchmarks are met; an interested in capacity building; a commitment to providing services and assistance in addition to financial support; an interest in measurable outcomes; working to attract other investors/contributors to the project; and the desire for financial return on investment. (Creative Capital, *Funding* 2)

As evidenced above, Creative Capital's initiatives responded affirmatively to pro-business, pro-capital, anti-liberal culture born in the Reagan years. Berlant calls the tide

[90] The other foundations included the Joe and Emily Lowe Foundation, the Joyce Mertz-Gilmore Foundation, and the Eli Broad Family Foundation. The list of the organization's major funders today can be found at <http://creative-capital.org/about/who-funders.html>.

of enterprise one of "oppressive optimism," since those who question its values on or cannot obtain financial abundance are often accused of being cynics and/or non-participatory citizens (13). Similarly, Creative Capital's idea of "payback" could be seen as a tacit approval of the claims that artists had unfairly taken benefits from the hands of the state for too long; they were self-centered and in need of a business discipline and acumen. Business entrepreneurialism, in this case, appeared the hub of generosity and access. At the same time, Creative Capital's programs appeared to embody business practices forsaken in the rise of the patron state. They put artists back on a road diverted between the Depression and the Vietnam War, when the nonprofits began to multiply and artists began working through bureaucratic programs such as the WPA, CETA, and the NEA. From the beginning, Creative Capital focused its initiatives and programs on bringing attention to artists' work. In doing so, the organization hoped to help artists recognize their processes as well (Atlas et al. 1-2).

Today Creative Capital continues to adapt practices from the commercial and non-profits sectors and to create programs that respond to artist's needs and encourage artist enterprise. Artists who engage in Creative Capital's programs learn entrepreneurial practices through long- and/or short-term assistance programs designed to support their own capacity building in the field (Lerner "Executive"; Atlas et al. 1-2). The organization envisions its programming in four thematic parts: "financial support, mediated access to consultants, strategic planning, and networking and training opportunities" (Atlas et al. 1). These components are realized through the organization's grant programs, technical assistance consulting, workshops and retreats, and promotional mechanisms such as its websites and publications (Lerner "Executive").

The organization takes steps to support each fellow's understanding of the whole material process as s/he develops a single work (Atlas et al. 1-2). All artists who receive

a Creative Capital Fellowship must participate in a retreat and orientation to receive ongoing technical assistance support (10). During the retreat, the fellows are introduced to the organization's "methodology for thinking." The methodology supports artists' theorized approaches to costs of living while making art work, distribution networks for their work, and promotions, as well as long- and short-term planning (Atlas et al. 16-19, 24). By the organization's account, the retreat offers insight into praxis in a field that often goes by "best practice," which are the actions based on the successful products of other artists or organization that artists are often encouraged to copy (Creative Capital, *Funding* 6). The organization claims not to reject best practice per se, but to contextualize best practice for the needs of each individual, independent artist.

Over the course of their grant period, which may last up to four years, Creative Capital fellows continue to work with staff and to attend retreats. During and after their grant periods, fellows continue to receive promotional support from the "Creative Capital Channel," its website dedicated to artist grantees. Initial grants of $10,000 are often matched or tripled in value through technical assistance funds and training programs (Creative Capital, Application). After attending the retreat, grantees begin the technical assistance process by attending a group orientation, meeting with staff to develop a long-term plan for their careers (Atlas et al. 11). Also, Creative Capital works with artists to determine a reasonable fee "pay back" to Creative Capital to support the organization's continued work in the field (Creative Capital, *Funding* 6) The actual figure, of up to 10% of net profits, is determined between the artist and the organization (Creative Capital, Application). The organization contends that the significance is greater. The pay back gestures to the commerce orientation of the organization's approach to each artist's work (Creative Capital, *Funding* 6).

Creative Capital programs are designed to be "strategic and catalytic," to provide "external and internal validation" and "mediated access to people" at a "decisive" period in an artist's career (Atlas et al. 2-3). They recognize artists' impulses, guide them through processes, and realize products. Through its programming the organization draws its wagons around a select group of artists, giving them access to an elite network and presenting them as "trained" and "ready." Essentially, they have "arrived" by Creative Capital's standards, and those standards are significant. Creative Capital is a major hub. The support provided by Creative Capital is long-term in a field where artists generally receive support from project-to-project. The idea of payback conveys an image of business acumen, an image that may be true to the artist, but the long-term support also abstracts the workings of Creative Capital's very big hand in promotion. The abstraction is embodied by the organization's four websites, which focus on each artist's accomplishments, Creative Capital's operations and programming, as well as the promotion of its accomplishments. For artists, Creative Capital's approach illustrates rational choice economist Bruno Frey's notion of "crowding theory," epitomizes a "crowding-in" of motivation where artists' internal processes are "informed" by external validation (142). Through its grantee programming, Creative Capital attempts to bridge nonprofit support with for-profit tactics and to help artists develop thriving careers (Atlas et al. 1, 11).

The Creative Capital granting cycle takes place over a three-year period. In the first year, they offer awards to "Visual Arts and Film/Video." In the second year, they recognize "Performing Arts, Emerging Fields, and Innovative Literature." In the third year, the organization takes a year off to follow-up on the previous years (Creative Capital, Application). Consequently, artists may apply to the organization only once every three years. Artists who have received a Fellowship during the past round or in

another discipline are asked not to apply again for two rounds. In general, the organization considers artists to be Fellows for up to 5 years (Creative Capital, Application).

In the summer of 1999, I attended an artist meeting with Creative Capital President Ruby Lerner to discuss the starting of the organization. The San Antonio meeting was held at ArtPace, a foundation for visual artists.[91] The artists gathered were told of the organization's mission; we were asked for comments on its structure and its relevance to our work. We were told that our conversation mirrored similar ones that were happening throughout the nation. We were also asked to spread the word for the upcoming grant process. I mention these moments, because my meetings, as well as those other group meetings, stand in distinct counterpoint to Brenson's account of the NEA founding, when artists were not consulted (3-7). From outset, the organization appeared to engage dialectically with its bureaucratic predecessor, the NEA by consulting artists across the nation. The tour also echoed the very political "American Canvas" tour conducted by former NEA Chair Jane Alexander in 1995. Alexander used the tour to garner attention for the many and varied cultural practices in the nation and to shore up support for the failing NEA (Alexander, *Command*; Larson, *American Canvas*).

Creative Capital's tour did gather support and an enthusiastic response from artists. In the first round of grants, Creative Capital received 1,810 visual, performance and media applications, far more than the 1,200 the organization had anticipated. Artists from 46 states, Washington D.C. and Puerto Rico submitted applications. Almost 40 percent of the applicants came from New York. Lerner was affirmed by the geographical spread in the first round: "This says a lot about the need that is out there, about the pent-up demand" (Dobrzynski, "New Arts"). The statement, much like the announcements

[91] ArtPace—the two words are combined accordingly—is a visual arts foundation established by Pace Picante Sauce heir Linda Pace in 1996.

and tour, recognized the discourse of need circulating throughout the nation and wielded the discourse as rhetoric for the organization's justification.

I applied in the first round and received my first rejection letter from Creative Capital in January, 200l. The letter informed me that my application had been considered in the final round. By the time of my application, I had already raised funds and developed the full-length version of *Memory's Caretaker*, and so I was naively asking for some funds to return my investment on the show, some marketing assistance which included designing a website, and the training and benefits that would come to a grantee—to be part of what I thought of as the "family" of Creative Capital.[92] I say "naively" because I did not recognize then what I know now about grant culture. Grants are relentlessly future thinking. One must propose work that one is going to do, but as the Creative Capital "FAQ" ("Frequently Asked Questions") page indicates, one must have one's executive producer lined up, and a system of supports in place for all but the requested amount (Application).

In a program designed to provide support, Creative Capital wants artists to reveal themselves as already supported. As I showed in my last chapter, the conditions of support can vary geographically, as well as with respect to race, class, gender. Artists in certain areas, among certain communities, may be drawn to providing support for an ailing cultural organization, in much the same way that Ibarra was drawn to help the Guadalupe Cultural Arts Center. Support can be a product of a certain market. In New York, the performance scene has a strong for-profit component. *Well*, a two person play by performance artist Lisa Kron, which was originally funded by Creative Capital, currently appears on Broadway.

---

[92] These funds included the fees for the director and lighting designer, Steve Bailey, the sound designer, Emily Kahn, my costume, the production photography and video production, which I had paid for out of pocket.

Shortly after receiving my rejection letter, I received a call from the performance program coordinator who encouraged me to continue applying and invited me to call a program assistant who would read the peer-review panelists comments about my application over the phone. I asked how many artists in New York had received fellowships and was told that the majority of the recipients were from New York. I responded rather curtly that the organization really needed to consider geographical diversity as a factor. I regret to say I was too sensitive to retrieve my comments. As I would later learn, of the 75 artists awarded in the first round, 40 were from the New York City area, 2 were from New York State, 12 form California and 3 from Minnesota, with 13 other states and D.C receiving 1 each. In her *New York Times* article mentioning the winners, reporter Judith H. Dobrzynski led with a statement that was difficult for me to read: "In the first round of grants is any guide, New York City is, hands down, the nation's creative capital" ("New York Artists").[93]

The organization continues to have a limited geographical reach. In 2005 Creative Capital commissioned the report, *At the Intersection: The First Five Years* by Caron Atlas, Helen Bronner, and Kathie DeNobriga. Forty-two grantees were interviewed, and only 7 rejected grantees were interviewed (51). The grantees were equally divided among men and women. The responders were divided by thirds among New York, California, and "Other." With respect to ethnicity, 63 per cent (i.e. 32) were Euro-American, 12 percent (or 6) were African-American, 14 percent (or 7), 12 percent (or 6) were Latino/a, and 0 were Native American (54). At the Alternate ROOTS meeting in 2004, DeNobriga asked for artists who had been rejected by Creative Capital to contact her about participating in the study. I volunteered that day and emailed twice

[93] In the first round, "1,800 artists from 46 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico" applied, but the organization did not publicize their geographic percentiles of applications received (Dorbrzynski, "New York Artists"). In the 2005 application process, I noted that artists were asked to specifically apply for shows they would be developing in the next year, but not one they had already developed.

asking to participate but received no response. I was disappointed to find the pool of interviewees so small and the geographical spread of the responders closer to the outcomes of the granting process. I considered it a failure of the approach.

The findings of the study focus largely on a few factors. *At the Intersection* characterized geographical reach as the largest problem facing Creative Capital. The organization did not see a problem with gender or racial parity. According to *At the Intersections*, 65 percent of its recipients are from New York and California and that "[i]f Illinois were added the 71% of the grantees are from 3 states" (28-29). The study listed a number of possible reasons, including "lack of regional support," "geographical relocation," "poor work samples," and "application fatigue." Application fatigue is the term the authors used to describe the cyclical process by which artists from a region stop applying when they see the applications going to artists in other regions or of other identities. The organization claimed that it had worked to cultivate more artist applicants from regions by making personal appeals—a move that explained the phone call I received. The study's authors also recognized that most of the peer panelists who reviewed grants were from New York and California and that the ratio of panelists to grantees was roughly the same as the outcome: panels that were 41 percent from New York and 20 percent from California begat grantees 43 percent from New York and 22 percent from California (31-35).

In total, the assessment revealed that the organization's practices gave artists limited access by emphasizing the skills appropriate to certain regions. The entrepreneurs hailed by the grant process were "risk-takers" in their three states, but often "ironic" entrepreneurs in many other states. The geographical failure presented these ironic entrepreneurs as tired, unsupported, and unprepared. The organization presented itself as tired too. Much like the "dot com era" entrepreneurs that inspired Creative

Capital's founding, the organization ran the risk of "crashing" at times because of its overloaded infrastructure (36-37). The staff was overworked. The open application pool meant that the organization generally received about 2,000 to 3,000 per grant round (35, 56). Nevertheless, the organization indicated that it had raised $100,000 from the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation to study the feasibility of regional initiatives.

At the Intersection presented Creative Capital's greatest strength as its consistency with its fellows, yet I believe that the organization's narrow reach represents its inconsistency with the promise of its original national tour across the nation. This limitation could be remedied through the more geographical parity on its panel and continued study. For its own part, the organization has attempted to reach more communities immediately through its Professional Development Program (PDP).

In 2003, Creative Capital inaugurated the PDP in eighteen cities to counter the limited reach of its programs. The PDP is a two-and-a-half day retreat based on corporate motivational model. A series of professionals interact with artists and offer the tools of the corporate workplace. According to Creative Capital, the PDP is the same program offered to the grantees during the retreat, but without the benefit of follow-up funding. During the two-day PDP, artists share work with each other and business consultants and learn Creative Capital's "methodology for thinking" In the PDP, artists examine their short- and long-term planning processes as well as material practices that attend their art-making (Atlas et al. 19).

In December 2005, I took a one-day version of the PDP, which was held at the National Performance Network Annual Meeting in Miami. About forty artists were welcomed at the meeting by Alyson Pou, who is also a visual and performance artist, as well as the Associate Director in charge of the PDP at Creative Capital. Pou introduced the program, gave a brief history, and encouraged us to take the longer version whenever

we could, before introducing our three "consultants and co-Leaders for strategic planning, marketing, and fundraising." From the outset, the organization offered rhetoric about the success of its approach. The rhetoric was about not needing. It was about strategic, or smart, access. In the first few moments, I was both hooked and suspect. The potential extrinsic validation for being a "smart artist" informed my desire to be a working artist. The likelihood that I was going to have the same outcome as everyone there made me wonder if the organization's approach was, indeed, magical. And yet the idea of such a solution countered my experience and judgment with respect to need, support, networks. The approach appeared chimerical. Throughout the workshop, I found myself vacillating between belief and incredulity and alternately judging each response.

Colleen Keegan, a financial advisor from Keegan Fowler, began her discussion about strategic planning by telling all of us, "First of all, get an accountant, get a lawyer. You need to professionalize. You need to plan." Keegan had a boisterous and assertive presence. She spoke in brief sound bytes. She told us she had begun consulting with non-profits a few years before and found herself drawn to working with artists. Although she was not an artist herself, she could see that we just needed to apply the business principles to our lives. Keegan told us that we needed long-range plans of ten years, fifteen years and a lifetime. We needed short term plans of one, three, and five years. We needed "to plan each month, each week, each day." Said Keegan, "You need to budget for income and expense so that you have enough money to take time off. If you don't get a vacation, you will burn out." Keegan told us that we would be working on our plan in our break-out session.

As indicated in *At the Intersection* the organization tries to resist a "one size fits all" approach. Keegan's approach was just that. I wondered how people felt about getting an accountant and getting a lawyer without knowing what exactly for. Keegan's

suggestions lacked context. What, for instance, was the purpose of these professionals with respect to our different disciplines? Would a tax preparer do, or was she suggesting financial advice, and if so, why not a financial advisor? At the same time, Keegan's invitation, even the challenge to "professionalize" served as a potent reminder that there was still so much more I could do to improve my work as an artist-producer.

Jackie Battenfield, a visual artist and former Creative-Capital Fellow, introduced herself by telling her story: she was already a painter, the mother of two children, and running a small nonprofit art gallery, when her husband quit his job because of burnout. Battenfield decided to generate the family's income through her art-making. She quit her own job with a nonprofit and began to pursue galleries, staying on friends' sofas whenever she traveled to meet with gallery directors. In her first year, she projected a need for $40,000 to support her children. She managed to make the money by following through with contacts that she had, or contacts that she made through networked associations. The following year, she budgeted an additional $10,000and made it again, and another $10,000 the year after. She told us she planned to talk to us about our marketing (Battenfield, PDP). Battenfield was enthusiastic and intriguing. She embodied a "can do" spirit that was meant to inspire us. Her plus-$10,000 formula had me imagining a very comfortable existence, but also thinking of what I might have failed to do. Her introduction clearly indicated that she was a well-networked artist, someone whose best practice I should copy.

The idea of budgeting for income was the most radical idea I would broach that day. I had always budgeted for expenses and income in my projects. I had only budgeted for expenses in my life, assuming that income was subject to what demand would come, rather than what demand I cultivated. Battenfield's notion reminded me that even my all-knowing approach to Jaclyn was shortsighted. I had not looked beyond

the network of BREAD itself to greater issues of her income and expense. Battenfield presented a model for aligning extrinsic supports with internal values. I recognized that in the past I had often been fortunate in obtaining the bookings and commissions I pursued. Often, I did not get them in the short span of time I anticipated, but the returns came eventually. Then I remembered that there were many opportunities I had missed and there were many opportunities I took for other reasons than monetary capital, such as the chance to participate in my community. The comparison of Battenfield's work to my own seemed tenuous, since her work consisted of a commodity, and yet her message of professionalizing complemented Keegan's and made me want to personalize the messages. I wondered if there were other ways to become collaboratively entrepreneurial, rather than purely competitive.

Aaron Landsman, a soft-spoken playwright and Creative Capital Fellow, introduced himself and talked about his past experiences of writing grants. At one time, he would wait till the last minute to write and submit grants. In recent years he had learned to "jot down a few notes way in advance of the deadline" when the pressure was not yet on and to return to those notes in the weeks that followed, tweaking prose and budgets until two or three weeks prior to the deadline. We were encouraged to share our grants with colleague throughout our writing processes, but especially before submitting.

Landsman's suggestions had collaborative aspects, even as they participated in competitive programs. His account reminded me that there were times that I did write my applications at the last minute. Indeed, the rejections often amounted to a message that I had not done enough, that I should have been more prepared. At the same time, I realized there were structural problems with many grant programs, such as regional access and older models based on Ford era initiatives. The prevalence of grantwriting as one-third of the PDP revealed the organization's belief in older models even as it

espoused new approaches. Lacking in the introduction was a gesture to the differences of opportunity by region, a discussion of application fatigue, indeed the very tools of interrogation that would have revealed the nuanced, entrepreneurial approaches.

In each of the sessions that followed, we moved from narrative testimonies to working from handouts and tasks. Landsman distributed the "Fundraising Fundamentals," a workbook he wrote, which outlines the "Eight Sources of Support" ("individuals, fellowships, project grants, government agencies, service organizations and residencies, in-kind goods and services, earned income for services, and earned income for goods"), which I outlined in the previous chapter (1-4). Landsman's handout also breaks down each proposal into its basic components, including the narratives and budget worksheets. We glanced briefly at this handout before writing and sharing prose for a potential grant.

In the "Supporting Your Work" breakout, Battenfield gave us two handouts, PR Information" and "Basic Tools for Promoting Your Work." The former informs artists how to familiarize themselves with various media outlets and to prepare promotional materials. The latter is essentially a template for an individual artist's promotional kit, which can be tailored to garner work or press. After going through the handouts, we were told that we only had a short time to share our promotional kits with each other. At Battenfield's instruction, we traded press kits and wrote critiques of each other press kits. Because a number of artists did not bring kits, Battenfield showed us a copy of Landsman's. She showed us his "quote sheet," a simple sheet of concise bits of high praise for Landsman's work from critics across the nation. She showed us his concise bio, photographs of his works, and the few very favorable reviews. Recognizing Landsman's presence as a Creative Capital Fellow, I felt that I did not have enough time with his book.

Keegan presented us with the *Creative Capital Strategic Planning Workbook*, a workbook broken down into issues of goals (short and long term), time (tracking and tracking evaluation), "likes and dislikes" (with regards to art practice, "income generating" and likes and dislikes evaluation), financial tracking, projections, and evaluations. Throughout our session, she told us that in a real, three day workshop we would have time to actually fill in the workbook. Because we could not do so in the short time we had, she encouraged questions, which were varied. One person asked about getting bookings, and Keegan encouraged her to attend the other session. Another person asked how to budget for income, incredulous that it could be done.

Early on, I got the feeling of "how great the opportunity to be a Creative Capital Fellow" and how unfortunate that I had missed being one. The scaled-down approach seemed to require the panelists to tell us what we missed, and it made me hungry for more. I wanted very much to have access to the program, to mediate its recommendations with my own beliefs and practices. I assumed that over time, I could actually do so. I wondered, too, if I would be able to challenge the organization with respect to its practices and to diversify its geographical reach. Or could I find a way to participate in a process-oriented approach that would challenge its definition of entrepreneurs, which seemed largely drawn from corporate culture.

Indeed, through its attempt to remedy the faults of the NEA, Creative Capital has become something of its antithesis. It is market-driven. Creative Capital's advocacy for a certain few artist-entrepreneurs amounts to a zero-sum gain for artists who are not similarly anointed by its programming (Barber 19). With its ambitious marketing and funding history, the Creative Capital symbolizes a great opportunity and obstacle to a number of independent performers, challenging them to define, in context, how and whether they want to be entrepreneurs. Indeed, its entrepreneurial discourse begs for the

unpacking of other entrepreneurial discourses, which include acknowledge the risk-taker, the intermediary, and even the ironic uses of the term "entrepreneur." In the letter regarding my grant rejection this year, I was encouraged to contact Creative Capital and inquire about hosting a PDP in my city (Lerner, Correspondence). According to Creative Capital program coordinator Heather MacDonald, the PDP can be held in any sponsoring city for the sum of $25,000, or "basically about $1,000 an artist, since the workshop can accommodate 24 artists" (Conversation). Many artists, she notes receive the workshop for free, because the meetings are funded by local arts councils, like the Miami-Dade Arts Council and the Oklahoma Visual Arts Council, as well as private funders, like the Heinz Endowment in Pittsburgh. I explained that the nearest meeting was Houston and that my request to participate had been denied. MacDonald put the ball in my court, encouraging me to raise the interest and funds in my community: "I can send you a packet if you are interested," she said. Clearly, the organization knew the value of its services and challenged me to step up the plate if I wanted its access. I said that I was interested and asked her to send the packet.

I imagined the networks that I would access to raise money. I would go to Felix Padrón, the head of the Office of Cultural Affairs, and ask for money. I would call Linda Pace at the ArtPace Foundation, or network through friends and ask for space and money. Indeed, I would access the many networks I had created or jumped onto since I created my first performance in 1992.

But had I identified a real need, or was I just in a space of what Barber might call "coerced association" when I said, "Send me the packet"? Was I just juggling the discourses of need that have attended my career as an independent artist with a program that had the appearance of support? Was I balancing the needs of others with my own? Was Creative Capital's version of entrepreneurialism what I wanted to learn and share?

In part, yes. The artists of my city know each other. We attend each other's performances and openings. We advocate for each other and encourage each other. As an artist-citizen-scholar who is also an artist-producer, I continue to want access to greater methods practice. I want to mediate our discussions of opportunity with recognitions of genuine need, as opposed to presumed needs. I want more space and time to unpack the terms of our work and the stories of our lives. I want skills to counter rhetorics of entitlement. I want to bear witness to the processes of my own work and to those of my colleague artists. I want have these processes recognized as we find, create, or offer support.

My examination of the word "entrepreneur," much like "network," "need," and "support," has shown me that the word's ambivalent appeal offers not only the history of its use, but also a clear picture of its salience to artists' contemporary practices. Creative Capital's programs may have limited appeal to some artists and limited availability to others, based on its principles and its granting practices, respectively; however, its programs do offer insight into its theorized practices. Much like the definitions of entrepreneur, some of these practices may help explain an artist's work or how an artist is perceived in society. The information contributes to a greater understanding artist practice overall.

Two weeks after my first call to Creative Capital, I receive an email from MacDonald letting me know that she is leaving her position, but that she has already contacted the San Antonio Office of Cultural Affairs to request funds and an opportunity to teach the PDP in San Antonio. She informs me that her successor will follow-up on the initiative and invites me to get in touch. I realize that, if anything, the organization itself functions as a risk-taking entrepreneur.

Postscript

In this study, I have theorized how independent artists might develop a consciousness about their practices through the discourses that permeate the cultural sector. In doing so, I offer artists another skill for reading and envisioning new and unique approaches to older practices. As I have argued, the discourses operating in the cultural sector hold a history that, when revealed more fully, portrays artists as both the beneficiaries and the patrons of the cultural sector. I believe that an independent performing artist familiar with the discursive history of practice will also be able to collapse time into a moment and speak plainly about network opportunities and costs, regard whose needs are met through the art work, discern how support might be meted out between the self and others, and use the term "entrepreneur" to build a career. For this very level of preparedness, I pursued graduate studies, and by thinking through these themes, I have continued to make work as a practicing artist.

I have felt my own consciousness grow as I prepared this document, and I have watched myself perform it, too. Fresh and exhausted from submitting my dissertation to committee in Austin on March 13, 2006, I returned to Jump-Start Performance Co. in San Antonio for a dress rehearsal of *Fringe and Fringe Ability*. I wrote the first act of the show in the summer of 2004, shortly after entering doctoral candidacy. The show was a long-postponed sequel to my first three shows—*Talk of the Town*, *The Bible Belt and Other Accessories*, and *Love in the Time of College*. I had imagined that such a show might help kick-start my return to touring after coursework.

In the show, my alter ego, John Hobson, had left his rural dystopia, grown up, and reached new heights as a flight attendant for a Texas-based airline, who, much like many artists, moonlights with a second job. As John explains himself: "Because the $20 I earn

for every $254 miles I fly doesn't quite cover all my expense, I take additional work making custom home accessories. You may have seen my sign for 'Sitting Pretty' at Whole Foods Market?"

Much like many artists, John finds his work caught up in a structure of misplaced needs and supports and his entrepreneurial skills called to task:

> My [Sitting Pretty] customers, they tend to lean on me, if not emotionally, then by placing a hand on my arm as they ponder a change. "Do you think it will work?" they ask. "I want [your work] be good, but I don't want to spend too much," [they say]. It is a cautious dance. Trained on a diet of television shows in which everything is done for under $1,000 with no accounting for labor, they are accustomed to counting on something for nothing. I like to assure them that everything is possible even as I figure out how to make it worthwhile for me, and they usually say something like, "What would I do without out you?" or "Why is it you [gay] people are always so good at what you do?"

In this passage, I see so many elements of my practice as an artist: the propensity to make something for nothing and the abstraction of labor into product, the desire to satisfy audience members, patrons, and presenters, even cautious supply-side financial negotiations, and the expectation of discounted labor from patrons (Kriedler 157). As the show develops, it becomes clear that John's journey is, on a greater level, about negotiating his place amid the networks of his association, just as my own writing found me negotiating my place as a colleague and critic in the field of performance. The show is also about comedy and about facing these conflicts with a sense of humor and a willingness to go forward.

The production of *Fringe* that accompanied my dissertation writing was my fourth iteration of the show. Because it was a rewrite of a version I had premiered in Boston six months before, I still had to rehearse nightly, even as I spent my days thinking about the discourses of practice in the field. Because the production dates had been planned so many months in advance, I could not pull back from my obligation—the theater company depended on it as did I for multiple reasons. The funding for the production came from a grant from the Kronkosky Foundation in San Antonio to which I had contributed both language and testimony during the Kronkosky Program Officer's site visit. The "Electric Performance Lab" at Jump-Start, which the Kronkosky funded, was a work-in-progress series through which artists developed shows during facilitated feedbacks. It was generously supported, and for the first time in my *Fringe* history, I did not have the raise additional funds to present the work.

I recognize a number of needs swirling around the production. I "needed" the $1,600 that the production would pay me; likewise my crew was working for income. I needed the opportunity to finalize this show, to make a promotional video, and to take promotional photographs for future touring. I also needed to focus on my dissertation writing, and so I relied on my director and assistant director/stage manager to help me stay focused in rehearsals. The theater company needed to honor the terms of the grant and to show that the show had appeal. The Kronkosky foundation needed to fulfill its mission as a cultural patron.

The show revealed the level of support I have found as a company member of Jump-Start and as an artist being presented. Nightly, the assistant stage manager emailed me the "edits" I had made "on my feet" earlier in rehearsal. I also received email and call reminders about costumes. The Jump-Start staff circulated fliers, sent out press releases and photos, and made personal calls to audience members from the reservation lists of

my previous shows. Once I turned in my dissertation, I joined the staff in making calls to prospective spectators. Likewise, the company and a few friends committed themselves to attending my feedback sessions. In the week before opening, an important crew member succumbed to a severe depression, and so our production team reorganized. We took on additional duties and brought in someone else from the staff to be present. In this act of concern for both the crew member and the show, I saw the teamwork that continues to inspire my ongoing practice.

Our efforts were entrepreneurial, taking advantage of numerous personal and professional networks as we raised funds, gathered the crew, and put on a show, and worked together. Nightly, we invited audiences to critique the show. We invited them to participate in feedback and to get involved with the company, which is now in its twenty-first year. We tallied our surveys for our report to the Kronkosky foundation and future grants and promotions. We invited audience members to submit comments to the company's weblog at www.jump-start.org. As soon as the show closed, I wrote a report for Jump-Start to share with Kronkosky that combined the spoken responses during my feedback sessions and made suggestions for future Electric Performance Lab productions. In addition, I volunteered to rewrite the nightly "curtain speech" to be more fun and more positive about the accomplishments of Jump-Start. Once the show closed, I began contacting prospective presenters and informing them that I would send copies of my video and press kit.

This examination has provided a means for me to consider my practices and to plan for my work in the future; it has also helped me realize how my colleagues in the field remain actives resources to work. On the night that *Fringe* opened, I visited with my director and friend, Steve Bailey, my dramaturg and friend, Zachary Dorsey, and another presenter and friend, Sixto Wagan, the Performance Director for Diverseworks, a

cultural center in Houston, TX. Along with Jump-Start and an organization called Artswatch in Louisville, KY, Diverseworks has commissioned a new show I will write and premiere in October 2006. As we sat discussing recent leadership changes at a number of prominent foundations, I happened to mention my inability get much information about LINC. Wagan informed me that Diverseworks was working closely with LINC. Wagan said that the LINC's structure was such that the flow of information would come from the ally organizations. Essentially, he told me that all the information I needed was would not be found in the hub, LINC, but in the nodes like Diverseworks. The information made me consider how network power might be reorganized through practice, and how my own analysis of networks needed to include new structures.

I do believe that there are more words and terms left to unpack. "Competition" and "collaboration," much like need and support, are two words that have an almost complementary nature. Each one can offer a nuanced picture of how individuals interact with respect to a common purpose, either separately or together. The word "grant" suggests a totality or gift. Historically, it is associated with land grants. As I argue in my chapter on need, the presumed gift aspect of grants has made artists susceptible to accusations of entitlement. But Grampp notes that most grants are merely contracts for labor (41). Even the word "artist" begs for continued unpacking, especially since the word is often modified with a type of artist. There are "working artists," "professional artists," "regional artists" in addition to artists defined by disciplines. What typologies best locate artists in their day-to-day practices and associations and how might shared, nuanced definitions befit the development of ongoing practices? As these words suggest, historically informed discourses about the cultural sector offer artists a key to consciousness and growth with respect to their practices.

Tables

Table 1: NALAC Grant Application

Summarize (50 words)

The Latino/a Performance Initiative (LPI) is a four-person ensemble led by Paul Bonin-Rodriguez. LPI artists take a materialist approach to supporting performance. Over two years, we will 1) create new works, 2) observe, document and evaluate our processes, 3) write, publish, and hold forums about our work for other performers, scholars, and funders.

Narrative

Introduction

The Latino/a Performance Initiative (LPI) is a project-based coalition that supports equally the creation of new performance and the development of independent performing artists by taking a materialist-centered approach to each artist's projects and practices. In doing so, we not only support our work as artists, but find new ways to make performance careers available to others. The LPI is currently led by Paul Bonin-Rodriguez; it includes independent performing artists Amalia Ortiz, José Rubén De León, and Maria Ibarra. The LPI is a project-based organizational model that may be replicated by other artists.

Demographics

The Latino/a Performance Initiative will perform its work at Jump-Start Performance Co. Jump-Start's definition of community is very broad and inclusive, yet

the company works in extremely distinct communities and neighborhoods, building connections and long-term relationships. Jump-Start functions and does most of its programming in urban San Antonio, Texas, one of the poorest cities in the United States with a very low per capita income. The majority of the population is Chicano/Mexican American (60%), European American (30%), African American (7%) and others. Various communities served by Jump-Start include but are not limited to constituents reflecting the artistic company's diversity of age, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, and class history; an ethnically diverse queer culture, inner-city youth, artists and audiences exploring contemporary art, dance, theater and performance, diverse identities within the Mexican American culture including Latino, Chicano, Tejano, Mexicano and Mexican American; a progressive left political community, African American artists, audiences, students, and organizations, and neighborhood communities.

Mission, History, and Artistic Programming and History

The Latino/a Performance Initiative (LPI) is a four-person ensemble led by Paul Bonin-Rodriguez. LPI artists take a materialist approach to supporting performance. Over two years, we will 1) create new works, 2) observe, document and evaluate our processes, 3) market our works collectively, and 4) write, publish, and hold forums about our work for other performers, scholars, and funders.

LPI is new. Our ensemble emerged from conversations conducted for Paul Bonin-Rodriguez's dissertation-in-progress, *Artists and the Material World*, which asks how the systems of support for independent performing artists can account for artistic processes as well as the products they create. José, Maria, and Amalia – each of whom has produced work in the past – spoke of being daunted by the intricacies of the NALAC application and the Creative Capital application, as well as the match required. In

addition, the artists spoke of gaps of knowledge with regards to formal marketing, creating press kits, self-representation, negotiating contracts, and even the secondary work that artists take to support their art. During the conversation, we raised the question about models of mentorship that exist in our field. At first, we attempted to collaborate on a single work. After some discussion, we realized that we could use the development of solo shows as a means to mutually support each other, observe our processes, and share our knowledge – all under Paul's leadership.

Purpose

Formal models of mentorship between artists are few, if any. Some organizations, such as Creative Capital, have created fellowship programs in which artists come together for technical assistance training; however, artists are not encouraged explicitly to support each other. Likewise, individually-administered project grants and fellowships do little to capitalize and share the information derived from experience, practice, observation, and evaluation. We have created this collective model to support four artists in the San Antonio community. Paul will lead the first LPI. After the first period, the three artists may choose to lead others through a similar process. We do not intend to form a new organization, but, through our writing and documentation, we intend to create a model that other artists and funders may adopt and adapt.

Details of project

During the two years, each artist will create a tour-ready solo performance piece.

Paul Bonin-Rodriguez will create *Off the Cuota*, a bilingual, multi-media, autobiographical solo show that responds to his 2000 work, *Memory's Caretaker* and

addresses his experiences as a Mexican-American on the other side of the border. *Off the Cuota* will be directed by Paul's longtime collaborator Steve Bailey.

Amalia Ortiz will finalize and make tour-ready her production of *Otra Esa on the Public Transit*, an original one-woman multi-media piece that combines spoken-word poetry and monologues to tell of events and characters encountered while riding on the bus in San Antonio, the Chicano Capital of the world. *Otra Esa on the Public Transit* is being directed by Maria Ibarra. This show has been presented in workshop form at Teatrofest for the Guadalupe Cultural Arts Center.

José will complete and make tour-ready *Lara*, a multi-media one-man play about Augustín Lara. Recently, he presented a concert version as *Simplemente Lara* at Jump-Start Performance Co. in San Antonio; he will reprise concert version in August 2005 and begin working on the theatrical version thereafter. The new show will be directed by Mary Evans, who directed Jose's one-man biographical show, *Lorca*. Like *Lorca* this show will be in Spanish and English.

Maria Ibarra will complete and make tour ready *Maldiciones de Milagros (Curses of Miracles)*, a bilingual, autobiographical solo show and about surviving cancer in 1997 and again after giving birth in 2000. The following excerpts of *Maldiciones de Milagros* have been presented twice at Jump-Start Performance Co.'s W.I.P. (Wednesdays-in-Performance/Works-in-Progress): "Vuela/I Can Fly," "Hair, with Curl," "Secrets Cause Cancer," and "Bone Marrow Biopsy."

All four shows will be produced at Jump-Start Performance Co. Each artist will keep a journal documenting her/his process. We intend to establish a weblog documenting our process. As each show is completed, each artist will assemble a press kit and video for touring options. Finally when all shows have premiered, the four artists will market the shows together through a mailer, as well as the weblog.

Documentation and evaluation are and integral part of this grant. During the grant period, the group will hold at least two public forums at Jump-Start in which we gather with other artists to discuss the making of the shows, the touring options, and our observations, as well as greater issues, such as the lag time between production and touring, secondary jobs, health insurance, short-term and long-term planning. Together we will write an article about the mentorship process for a scholarly journal, such as *Theater Topics* or *TPQ* (*Text and Performance Quarterly*). Finally, we will compile all four works and the article for publication.

Project timeline

We have taken a two-year cycle to accommodate both artists' and Jump-Start's schedules, and to give adequate focus to each artist's premiere.

Year One 11/05-9/06

Summer 2006 - Amalia premieres Otra Esa on the Public Transit

Summer 2006 - Jose premieres Lara

Summer 2006 - First Forum held

Year Two 10/06-9/07

Fall 2006- Maria premieres Maldiciones de Milagros

Spring 2007 - Paul premieres Off the Cuota

Spring 2007- Second Forum held

Spring 2007 – Group marketing. Group prepares article for publication

Summer 2007 – Group submits plays for publication

Impact or artistic significance

Among independent performers, mentorship often results from unfunded gift labor of artists. In recent years especially, San Antonio has been home and host to a variety of nationally-recognized Latino/a performers. Issues of professionalization have been worked out individually, with mentorship coming through informal meetings and referrals. As our conversations revealed, we have different levels of comfort with obtaining nationally competitive grants and recognition. This model supports product, requires a significant reflexivity and statements about process, and offers a model of artist growth for other artists to follow. By compensating the leader, we make evident that artists are not merely to be compensated for the products they create but the organizational work they do in the community and the arts field. We intend for this model to be replicated by each of the participants after the completion of one 2-year cycle and taken up by other artists.

Evaluation plan

Our reflection is a part of our process that will be made publicly evident through the Forums, as well as the documentation, the article writing, and the publication preparation – all of which we have adopted as part of our process. Within the group, we have committed to collectively fill the gaps of knowledge that exist by applying to additional funders, paying all artistic staff for each show, and making all shows tour-ready. Finally, each show will be developed at Jump-Start with the assistance of the Critical Response Process that is used to support new work.

Budget narrative – See detailed budget for each show as well as the collective budget

Artistic Fees – includes Artists, Directors Lighting and Sound Designers, and Musicians.

Royalties – to Augustin Lara.

Documentation – includes show videos, photography, and weblog design and maintenance.

Marketing – includes marketing for each show as well as group flyer design and postage.

Running Crews – for four shows.

Production Materials – include Studio Rentals for recording, sets, props, costumes, travel for videography, videographers for show, bilingual translation, and piano rental.

Production Overhead – includes Jump-Start space, utilities, rental at 8 weeks.

Evaluation – Artists will be compensated to create an article about the process.

Leadership fee – includes grant writing, administration, advisement, and reporting.

Umbrella – Jump-Start requires a 5% administrative fee for umbrella projects.

Income is detailed in the attached budgets.

Other funding

We estimate earned income at $9000. In addition, Jump-Start will provide $8,000 in direct operational costs.

Paul has been invited to apply to Creative Capital. In addition, as a member of Jump-Start, Paul may request $2,000 annually to create a new show. Since he has already committed to another show for the 2005-06 season, he will produce *Off the Cuota* in the 2006-07 season.

Maria, Jose, and Amalia will apply to Puffin Fdn. for $2,000 each and seek other funds.

Each artist will contribute in-kind donations, as will Jump-Start, which will make the theater space available for Forums.

We encourage NALAC not to reduce the amount requested from our budget. Given Jump-Start's programming schedule (which will allow for two performers

in 2005-06 and two more in 2006-07) and the breadth of this application, we do not feel that it can be accomplished in one year. Should the money requested be reduced, all artist and professional fees will be reduced incrementally and within reason.

Board of Directors

The Board of Directors of Jump-Start consists of twenty individuals. In the past year, 100% of the Board contributes to the organization for a total of $30,000.

Table 2: Budget for *Lara*

Jose Ruben de Leon - *Lara*

EXPENSE	$	In kind	Total
Artist	$1,500.00	$1,500.00	$3,000.00
Director	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	$2,000.00
Lighting Designer and Tour-ready Plot	$600.00		$600.00
Musicians (2 at $1000)	$2,000.00		$2,000.00
Production Materials (sets, props, costumes)	$250.00		$250.00
Studio Expenses for recording for tour (5 hours at $50)	$250.00		$250.00
Royalties to Augustin Lara	$300.00		$300.00
Video documentation (includes edit, master, and 10 copies)	$500.00		$500.00
Photography	$200.00		$200.00
Show marketing	$400.00		$400.00
J-S Production Overhead (space, utilities, staff, etc.)	$4,000.00		$4,000.00
Piano Rental		$1,000.00	$1,000.00
Running Crew (lights)	$300.00		$300.00
Total	$11,300.00	$3,500.00	$14,800.00
INCOME			
Box Office Receipts (50% for 6 perf based on concert figures)	$3,000.00		$3,000.00
Requested from NALAC-NFA	$4,300.00		$4,300.00
Puffin Foundation (pending)	$2,000.00		$2,000.00
Jump-Start Operational Funds	$2,000.00		$2,000.00
IN-KIND from Artists		$2,500.00	$2,500.00
IN-KIND Piano lending from Alamo Music Ctr.		$1,000.00	$1,000.00
Total	$11,300.00	$3,500.00	$14,800.00

Table 3: Budget for *Otra Esa on the Public Transit*

Amalia Ortiz - *Otra Esa on the Public Transit*	$	In kind	Total
EXPENSE			
Artist	$1,500.00	$1,500.00	$3,000.00
Director	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	$2,000.00
Lighting Designer and Tour-ready Plot	$600.00		$600.00
Sound Designer and CD	$600.00		$600.00
Production Materials (Sets, props, costumes)	$250.00		$250.00
Video documentation (includes edit, master, and 10 copies)	$500.00		$500.00
Photography	$200.00		$200.00
Show marketing	$400.00		$400.00
Running Crew	$600.00		$600.00
J-S Production Overhead (space, utilities, staff, etc.)	$4,000.00		$4,000.00
Total	$9,650.00	$2,500.00	$12,150.00
INCOME			
Box Office Receipts (50% for 6 perf. at 55% capacity)	$2,000.00		$2,000.00
NALAC - NFA Request	$3,650.00		$3,650.00
Puffin Foundation (pending)	$2,000.00		$2,000.00
Jump-Start Operational Funds	$2,000.00		$2,000.00
IN-KIND		$2,500.00	$2,500.00
Total	$9,650.00	$2,500.00	$12,150.00

Table 4: Budget for *Maldiciones de Milagros*

Maria Ibarra - *Maldiciones de Milagros*	$	In kind	Total
EXPENSE			
Artist	$1,500.00	$1,500.00	$3,000.00
Director	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	$2,000.00
Lighting Designer and Tour-ready Plot	$600.00		$600.00
Sound Designer and CD	$600.00		$600.00
Production Materials (sets, costumes, props)	$250.00		$250.00
Video documentation (includes edit, master, and 10 copies)	$500.00		$500.00
Photography	$200.00		$200.00
Show marketing	$400.00		$400.00
Running Crew	$600.00		$600.00
J-S Production Overhead (space, utilities, staff, etc.)	$4,000.00		$4,000.00
Total	$9,650.00	$2,500.00	$12,150.00
INCOME			
Box Office Receipts (50% of 6 perf. at 55% capacity)	$2,000.00		$2,000.00
Amount Requested from NALAC - NFA	$3,650.00		$3,650.00
Puffin Foundation (pending)	$2,000.00		$2,000.00
Jump-Start Operational Funds	$2,000.00		$2,000.00
IN-KIND		$2,500.00	$2,500.00
Total	$9,650.00	$2,500.00	$12,150.00

Table 5: Budget for *Off the Cuota*

Paul Bonin-Rodriguez - *Off the Cuota*	$	In kind	Total
EXPENSE			
Artist	$1,500.00	$1,500.00	$3,000.00
Director	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	$2,000.00
Lighting Designer and Tour-ready Plot	$600.00		$600.00
Sound Designer and CD	$600.00		$600.00
Production Materials (Props, sets, costumes)	$250.00		$250.00
Travel (Mexico)	$1,000.00		$1,000.00
Videographer (for production)	$1,000.00		$1,000.00
Bilingual Translation (for production)	$750.00		$750.00
Video documentation (includes edit, master, and 10 copies)	$500.00		$500.00
Photography	$200.00		$200.00
Show marketing	$400.00		$400.00
Running Crew	$600.00		$600.00
Jump-Start Production Overhead (space, utilities, staff, etc.)	$4,000.00		$4,000.00
Total	$12,400.00	$2,500.00	$14,900.00
INCOME			
Box Office Receipts (50% for 6 perf. at 55% capacity)	$2,000.00		$2,000.00
NALAC-NFA Request	$2,400.00		$2,400.00
Creative Capital Request	$4,000.00		$4,000.00
Jump-Start Co. Member New Prod. Funds	$2,000.00		$2,000.00
Jump-Start Operational Funds	$2,000.00		$2,000.00
IN-KIND		$2,500.00	$2,500.00
Total	$12,400.00	$2,500.00	$14,900.00

Table 6: Combined Budget

OVERALL BUDGET for Latino Performance Initiative

EXPENSE	$	In kind	Total
4 Artists (Artist Fees)	$6,000.00	$6,000.00	$12,000.00
4 Directors (Artist Fees)	$4,000.00	$4,000.00	$8,000.00
4 Lighting Designers (Artist Fees)	$2,400.00		$2,400.00
3 Sound Designers (Artist Fees)	$1,800.00		$1,800.00
2 Musicians (Artist Fees)	$2,000.00		$2,000.00
1 Royalties to Augustin Lara (Royalties)	$300.00		$300.00
4 Video Documentation - (Documentation)	$2,000.00		$2,000.00
4 Photography (Documentation)	$800.00		$800.00
Group Weblog Design (Documentation)	$450.00		$450.00
4 Show Marketing (Marketing)	$1,600.00		$1,600.00
Group Marketing – flyer and postage - (Marketing)	$900.00		$900.00
4 Running Crew (Crews)	$2,100.00		$2,100.00
1 Studio Rental for Lara Recording (Production Materials)	$250.00		$250.00
4 Production Materials (Production Materials)	$1,000.00		$1,000.00
1 Travel to Mexico for Video (Production Materials)	$1,000.00		$1,000.00
1 Production Videographer (Production Materials)	$1,000.00		$1,000.00
1 Bilingual Translation (Production Materials)	$750.00		$750.00
Piano Rental - 2 wks - $500 per wk (Production Materials)		$1,000.00	$1,000.00
4 J-S Production Overhead (space, utilities, staff, etc.)	$16,000.00		$16,000.00
Doc.- Evaluation Article by 4 Artists (Evaluation)	$1,600.00		$1,600.00
Project Leadership - Paul (Leadership)	$3,000.00		$3,000.00
Jump-Start Performance Co. 5% (Umbrella)	$1,050.00		$1,050.00
Total	$50,000.00	$11,000.00	$61,000.00
INCOME			
Box office (anticipated)	$9,000.00		$9,000.00
Creative Capital (Paul -Requested)	$4,000.00		$4,000.00
Puffin Foundation (Amalia, Jose, Maria - to request)	$6,000.00		$6,000.00
Jump-Start Operational Funds	$8,000.00		$8,000.00
Jump-Start Co. Member New Prod. Funds (Paul)	$2,000.00		$2,000.00
Amount Requested from NALAC - NFA	$21,000.00		$21,000.00
Artist Contributions		$10,000.00	$10,000.00

Piano Rental from Alamo Music Ctr.		$1,000.00	$1,000.00
Total	$50,000.00	$11,000.00	$61,000.00

Bibliography

Abbing, Hans. Why Are Artists Poor? The Exceptional Economy of the Arts. Amsterdam: Amsterdam UP, 2002.

Actors Equity Association. "Contract." Agreement and Rules Governing Employment Under the Off-Broadway Agreement. 2001-2005. 15 March 2006. <http://www.actorsequity.org/Library/rulebooks/Off_Broadway_Rulebook_01-05.pdf>, 27-31.

——. Agreement and Rules Governing Employment in Resident Theaters. 2001-2005. 15 March 2006. <http://www.actorsequity.org/Library/rulebooks/LORT_Rulebook_05-08.pdf>.

Adams, Don and Arlene Goldbard. Webster's World of Cultural Policy. 1996. Seattle: The Worldwide Center for the Institute for Cultural Democracy. 2001. 25 Jan. 2004. <http://www.wwcd.org/policy/policy.html>.

Alexander, Jane. Command Performance: An Actress in the Theater of Politics. New York: Public Affairs, 2000.

Alexander, Victoria D. Sociology of the Arts: Exploring Fine and Popular Forms. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2003.

Alper, Neal O. and Gregory H. Wassell. More Than Once in a Blue Moon: Multiple Jobholdings by American Artists. Santa Ana, CA: Seven Locks P, 2000.

Alternate ROOTS. "Mission." 2006. 6 April 2006. <http://alternateroots.org/>.

Americans for the Arts. Arts & Economic Prosperity: The Economic Impact of Nonprofit Arts Organizations and Their Audiences. 2002. 18 March 2004. <http://www.americansforthearts.org/economicimpact>.

Anzaldúa, Gloria. Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books, 1987.

Arce, Elia. Personal Interview. 26 June 2005.

Arce, Elia and Loris Bradley. Personal Interview. 29 September 2004.

Atlas, Caron. "Cultural Policy: In the Board Rooms and on the Streets." Community Arts Network. 25 Jan. 2004. <http://www.communityarts.net/readingroom/archive/intro-publicpolicy.php>.

Atlas, Caron, Helen Brunner, and Kathie DeNobriga. At the Intersection: A Programmatic Assessment of Creative Capital's Support to Artists. New York: Creative Capital, 2005. 14 August 2005. <http://www.creative-capital.org/about/reports/2005assessment.pdf>.

Bailey, Steve. Personal Interview. 9 April 2006.

Balfe, Judith Higgins. Introduction. Paying the Piper: Causes and Consequences of Arts Patronage. Ed. Judith Higgins Balfe. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1993. 1-5.

——. Conclusion. Paying the Piper: Causes and Consequences of Arts Patronage. Ed. Judith Higgins Balfe. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1993. 306-323.

Banes, Sally. "Institutionalizing Avant-Garde Performance: A Hidden History of University Patronage in the United States." Contours of the Theatrical Avant-Garde: Performance and Textuality. Ed. James Harding. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 2000. 217-236.

Barabási, Albert-László. Linked. New York: Plume, 2003.

Barabási, Albert-László and Eric Bonabeau. "Scale-Free Networks." Scientific American 288.5 (2003): 60-70.

Barabási, Albert-László and Zoltán N. Oltvai. "Network Biology: Understanding the Cell's Functional Organization." Genetics 5(2004): 101-115.

Barabási, Albert-László et al. "Scale-Free and Hierarchical Structures in Complex Networks." AIP Conference Proceedings 661.1 (2003): Unpaginated.

Barber, Benjamin R. *A Place for Us: How to Make Society Civil and Democracy Strong.* New York: Hill and Wang, 1998.

Barber, Benjamin. Shalini Venturelli, Gigi Bradford, and Sondra Myers. Culture at the Table: Cultural Policies for the 21st Century. Proc. of Roundtable Sponsored by the Center for Arts and Culture. 19 March 2001. 24 Jan. 2004. <http://www.culturalpolicy.org/archive/news/table.pdf>.

Battenfield, Jackie and Aaron Landsman. "Basic Tools for Promoting Your Work." Creative Capital Development Program. National Performance Network Conference, Miami, FL. 11 December 2005.

Battenfield, Jackie, Colleen Keegan, Aaron Landsman, and Alyson Pou. Creative Captial Professional Development Program. National Performance Network Conference. Miami, FL. 11 December 2005.

Battenfield, Jackie. "PR Information." Creative Capital Development Program. National Performance Network Conference, Miami, FL. 11 December 2005.

Baumol, William J. "Applied Welfare Economics." A Handbook of Cultural Economics. Ed. Ruth Towse. Cheltenhem, UK: Edward Elgar, 2003. 20-32.

Baumol, William J. and William G. Bowen. "Arguments for Public Support of the Performing Arts (1966)." The Economics of the Arts. Ed. Mark Blaug. Boulder: Westview, 1976. 42-57.

Behamou, Françoise. "Artists' Labour Markets." A Handbook of Cultural Economics. Ed. Ruth Towse. Cheltenhem, UK: Edward Elgar, 2003. 69-76.

Belgrad, Daniel. The Culture of Spontaneity: Improvisation and the Arts in Postwar America. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1998.

Bennett, Tony. Cultural Policy Beyond Aesthetics. Working Paper. The Cultural Policy Center, March 2000.

Bennett, Tony and Mike Savage. "Introduction: Cultural Capital and Cultural Policy." Cultural Trends 13.2 (2004): 7-14.

Berlant, Lauren. The Queen of America Goes to Washington City: Essays on Sex and Citizenship. Durham: Duke UP, 1997.

Blount, Simon. "Arts and Economics" (Book Review). Policy. 17.2 (Winter 2001): 52-55.

Boguñá, Marian. "Book Review: Evolution of Networks. From Biological Nets to the Internet and WWW." Journal of Statistical Physics 114.516 (2004): 1627-1628.

Bolton, Richard, ed. Culture Wars: Documents from the Recent Controversies in the Arts. New York: The New Press, 1992.

Bonin-Rodriguez, Paul. *Fringe and Fringe Ability*. Unpublished. 2004.

——. "Latino Performance Initiative." Grant Application to National Association of Latino Arts and Culture (NALAC). 10 June 2005.

Bonin-Rodriguez, Paul and Jaclyn Pryor. "Performing Networks: A Reading Across Disciplinary, Imaginary, and Material Boundaries." Abriendo Brecha Conference. U of Texas at Austin. 18 February 2006.

Bonin-Rodriguez, Paul, Jaclyn Pryor, and Jill Dolan. "Colleague-Critic: Performance, Criticism, and Queer Collegiality." Borderlands Lecture Series. Arizona State U, 6 October 2005.

Bourdieu, Pierre. Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste. Trans. Richard Nice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1984.

——. "The Forms of Capital." Trans. Richard Nice. Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education. Ed. John Richardson. (New York: Greenwood, 1986). 241-258.

Bradford, Gigi. "Defining Culture and Cultural Policy." The Politics of Culture: Policy Perspectives for Individuals, Institutions, and Communities. New York: The New Press, 2000. 11-14.

Brenson, Michael. Visionaries and Outcasts: The NEA, Congress, and the Place of the Visual Artist in America. New York: The New Press. 2001.

Brown, Wendy. States of Injury: Power and Freedom in Late Modernity. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1995.

Brustein, Robert. "Coercive Philanthropy." 1995. The Politics of Culture. Ed. Gigi Bradford, Michael Gary, and Glenn Wallach. New York: The New Press, 2000. 218-225.

——. "Democracy and Culture." Democracy and the Arts. Ed. Arthur M. Melzer, Jerry Weinberger, and M. Richard Zinman. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1999. 11-25.

Burton, Tim, dir. Charlie and the Chocolate Factory. Prod. Bruce Berman et al. Warner Bros., 2005.

Cameron, Ben, et al. "Is There a Better Case for the Arts?" ArtsJournal Forum: A Public Conversation. 7-11 March 2005. 12 March 2005. <http://www.artsjournal.com/muse/>.

Carlos, Laurie and Renita Martin. Personal Interview. 26 May 2005.

Carlson, Ann, Joni Jones, Daniel MacIvor, Caden Manson, Richard Maxwell, Jemma Nelson. "Entrepreneurial Strategies." Fresh Terrain Symposium. The U of Texas at Austin. 25 January 2003.

Case, Sue-Ellen. "Introduction." Split Britches: Lesbian Practice/Feminist Performance. Ed. Sue-Ellen Case. London: Routledge, 1996.

——. "Playing in the Lesbian Workshop: Migrant Performance Labor." Performance as a Public Practice Distinguished Lecture Series. The U of Texas at Austin. 15 April 2005.

Caserta, Mauricio and Tiziana Cuccia. "The Supply of Arts Labor: Towards a Dynamic Approach." Journal of Cultural Economics 25 (2001), 185-201.

Castells, Manuel. End of the Millennium, Vol. I. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2000.

——. The Power of Identity, Vol. II. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1997.

——. The Rise of the Network Society, Vol. III. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1996.

Caves, Richard E. Creative Industries: Contracts between Art and Commerce. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2000.

Center for Arts and Culture. America's Cultural Capital: Recommendations for Structuring the Federal Role. March 2001. 24 January 2004. <http://www.culturalpolicy.org/pdf/acc.pdf>.

Chernow, Ron. Titan: The Life of John D. Rockefeller, Sr. New York: Random House, 1998.

Cherbo, Joni M. and Margaret J. Wyszomirski, "Mapping the Public Life of the Arts in America." The Public Life of Arts in America. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 2000, 3-21.

Choi, Jiyoun. American Arts Policy and the National Endowment for the Arts in the 1990s. Dissertation. The American University, 2002.

Cole, Heather Barfield. "Keepin' It Weird" (performance review). The Austin Chronicle Online Edition. 28 October 2005. 6 April 2006. <http://www.austinchronicle.com/issues/dispatch/2005-10-28/arts_review.html>.

Crabtree, Howard. "The Last Guru? The Cult of Castells." Wilson Quarterly 26.3 (2003): 103.

Craigslist. "Management." 10 February 2006. <http://www.craigslist.org/about/management.html>.

"Craigslist Austin. "Missed Connections." 22 December 2005. <http://austin.craigslist.org/mis/>.

Creative Capital. "Application." 2005. 1 April 2005. <http://creative-capital.org/application/>.

——. "Multi-Arts Production Fund " grant application. 2004.

——. President's Report: Funding Innovation: An Overview of Creative Capital's First Five Years. December 2003. 20 Feb. 2004. <http://creative-capital.org/about/inst-reports.html>.

——. "Strategic Planning Workbook." Creative Capital Development Program. National Performance Network Conference, Miami, FL. 11 December 2005.

Cultural Policy & the Arts National Data Archive. "The Arts & the Internet: How Has Technology and the Internet Impacted San Francisco Area Artists?" 2004. 30 March 2006. <http://www.cpanda.org/arts-culture-facts/ioa3-arts-web/ioa3-arts-web.html>.

Cummings, Milton C., Jr. and J. Mark Davidson Schuster, eds. Who Pays for the Arts? The International Search for Models of Arts Support. Washington D.C.: Americans for the Arts, 1989.

Cummings, Milton C., Jr. and Richard S. Katz. "Government and the Arts: An Overview." The Patron State: Government and the Arts in Europe, North America, and Japan. Eds. Milton C. Cummings, Jr. and Richard S. Katz. New York: Oxford UP, 1987. 3-16.

Dahl, Roald. Charlie and the Chocolate Factory. New York: Knopf, 1964.

Daly, Ann. "Beyond Richard Florida: A Cultural Sector of Our Own." Philadelphia: Dance Advance, 2005. 14 November 2005. <http://danceadvance.org/03archives/daly01>.

——. "Richard Florida's High Class Glasses." Grantmakers in the Arts Reader 15.2 (Summer 2004). 9 May 2005. <http://anndaly.com/articles/florida.html>.

Darlington, Madge, Lana Leslie, Kirk Lynn, Sarah Richardson, Mildred Rodriguez, Steven Sapp, Shawn Sides, Michael Smith (Moderator), Diana Szeinblum. "Entrepreneurial Strategies." Fresh Terrain Symposium. The U of Texas at Austin. 26 January 2003.

de Leon, Jose Ruben. Telephone Interview. 27 February 2006.

de Leon, Jose Ruben, Maria Ibarra, and Amalia Ortiz. Personal Interview. 31 May 2005.

Denning, Michael. The Cultural Front: The Laboring of American Culture in the Twentieth Century. London: Verso, 1997.

DiMaggio, Paul. "Can Culture Survive the Marketplace?" Journal of Arts Management and Law 13.1 (Spring 1983): 61-87.

——. "Cultural Policy Studies: What They Are and Why We Need Them." The Journal of Arts Management and Law 13:1 (1983): 241-248.

——. "Social Structures, Institutions, and Cultural Goods: The Case of the United States." 1991. The Politics of Culture. Eds. Gigi Bradford, Michael Gary, and Glenn Wallach. New York: The New Press, 2000. 38-62.

——. "The Nonprofit Instrument and Influence of the Marketplace on Policies in the Arts." The Arts and Public Policy in the United States. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1984. 57-99.

Dimaggio, Paul J. "Introduction." Cultural Policy Studies: What They Are and Why We Need Them. 13.1 (1983): 241-248.

DiMaggio, Paul J. and Helmut K. Anheier. "The Sociology of Nonprofit Organizations and Sectors." Annual Review of Sociology 16 (1990): 137-159.

DiMaggio, Paul and Kristen Stenberg. "Why Do Some Theatres Innovate More Than Others? An Empirical Analysis." Poetics 14 (1985): 107-22.

Dobryrzynski, Judith H. "New Arts Foundation Flooded with Grant Applications." The New York Times 26 August 1999, final ed., sec. E: 6.

——. "New York Artist Win Majority of a Foundation's First Grants." The New York Times 13 January 2000, late ed., sec. E: 3.

——. "Private Donors Unite to Support Art Spurned by the Government." The New York Times 3 May 1999, late ed., sec. E: 1+.

Donnelly, Peter. "The Private Sector's Role in Cultural Policy." Cultural Policy in the West. Denver: WESTAF, 2000. 73-80.

Dolan, Jill. Class Notes. The University of Texas at Austin. 1 March 2003.

——. "The Delicate Balance of Criticism." Feminist Spectator blog. 19 January 2006. 10 February 2006. <http://feministspectator.blogspot.com/2006/01/delicate-balance-of-criticism-ii.html>.

——. Introduction. Modern Drama 47.2 (2004): 165-176.

——. "Performance, Utopia, and the 'Utopian Performative.'" Theatre Journal 53.3 (2001): 455-480.

——. Utopia in Performance: Finding Hope at the Theater. Ann Arbor: The U of Michigan P, 2005.

Dorogovtsev, S.N. and J.F.F. Mendes. "Evolution of Networks." Advances in Physics 51.4 (2002): 1079-1187.

Dubin, Steven C. "Artistic Production and Social Control." Social Forces 64.3 (March 1986): 667-689.

Ehrenreich, Barbara and John Ehrenreich. "The Professional Managerial Class." Between Labor and Capital. Ed. Pat Walker. Boston: South End P, 1979, 5-48.

Ellmeier, Andrea. "Cultural Entrepreneurialism: On the Changing Relationship Between the Arts, Culture and Employment." The International Journal of Cultural Policy 9.1 (2003): 3-16.

"Entrepreneur." *Oxford English Dictionary Online*, 2nd Ed. 1989. 1 July 2005. <http://dictionary.oed.com/>.

Feld, Alan L., Michael O'Hare, and J. Mark Davidson Schuster. Patrons Despite Themselves: Taxpayers and Arts Policy. New York: New York UP, 1983.

First Night Austin. 17 January 2006. <http://www.firstnightaustin.org>.

First Night International. "About First Night. 2005. 17 January 2006. <http://www.firstnight.com/about/history.php>.

——. "Awards We Present." 2005. 17 January 2005. <http://www.firstnight.com/awards/wepresent.php>.

——. "First Night Cities." 2005. 17 January 2005. <http://www.firstnight.com/cities.php>.

Fishman, Charles. The Wal-Mart Effect. New York: Penguin, 2001.

Flores, Richard. R. *Los Pastores: History and Performance in the Mexican Shepherd's Play of South Texas*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1995.

——. Remembering the Alamo: Memory, Modernity, and the Master Symbol. Austin: U of Texas P, 2002.

Florida, Richard. The Rise of the Creative Class. 2002. New York: Basic Books, 2004.

——. "The Rise of the Creative Class: Why Cities without Gays and Rock Bands are Losing the Economic Development Race." Washington Monthly. May 2002. 28 Oct. 2003. <http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/features/2001/0205.florida.html>.

Ford Foundation. "Grant Information." 2004. 19 March 2006. <http://fordfound.org/grants_db/view_grant_detail.cfm?grant_id=233357>.

Fresh Terrain brochure. Dept. of Theater and Dance, U of Texas at Austin. 2003.

Frey, Bruno S. Arts and Economics: Analysis and Cultural Policy. Berlin: Springer, 2000.

Frey Bruno S. and Margit Osterloh,ed. Successful Management by Motivation: Balancing Intrinsic and Extrinsic Incentives. Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2002.

Frey, Bruno S. and Werner W. Pommerehne. Muses and Markets: Explorations in the Economics of the Arts. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell, 1989.

Galligan, Ann. M. and Neal O. Alper. "Characteristics of Performing Artists: A Baseline Profile of Sector Crossovers." Journal of Arts, Management, Law and Society 28.2 (1998): 155-178.

Garten, Jeffrey E. "Cities: Investing in the Culture is Simply Good Business." Businessweek 5 (March 2001): 26.

Godfrey, Marian A. "Policy and Philanthropy in the United States Cultural System." Private and Public Financing of Culture in the United States and France: New Synergies and Interdependencies. French American Symposium. Centre Français des Fondations, Paris. 6-7 March 2003. 28 January 2004. <http://www.pewtrusts.com/pdf/culture_godfrey_speech_french.pdf.>.

Goldbard, Arlene. "Artists Call for Cultural Policy." Online Petition 2004. 19 August 2004 <http://www.petitiononline.com/art2004/petition.html>.

——. "The Crisis in Cultural Policy." The Performance as Public Practice Distinguished Lecture Series. The U of Texas at Austin. 31 January 2003.

Goldberg, Rosalie. Performance Art: From Futurism to the Present. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1988.

Gomez-Pena, Guillermo and Lisa Wolford. "Navigating the Minefields of Utopia: A Conversation." TDR 46.2 (Summer 2002): 66-96.

Goodwin, Dolores Kearns. "The 17th Annual Nancy Hanks Lecture on Arts and Public Policy." Washington, D.C., 29 March 2004. 23 May 2005. <http://www.artsusa.org/global/print.asop?id=1399>.

Grampp, William. Pricing the Priceless: Art, Artists, and Economics. New York: Basic Books, 1989.

Gramsci, Antonio. Selections from the Prison Notebooks. Ed. and trans. by Quinton Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. New York: International Publishers, 1971.

Hammack, David C., ed. Making the Nonprofit Sector in the United States. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1998.

Harris, Neil. "Art and the Public Purpose: The American Historical Experience." The Philosophical Society of Texas Proceedings 1997. Austin, TX: The Philosophical Society of Texas, 2000. 9-24.

Harvey, David, The Condition of Postmodernity. Cambridge: Blackwell, 1990.

Heilbronner, Robert and Lester Thurow. Economics Explained. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1982.

Heilbrun, James. "Baumol's Cost Disease." A Handbook of Cultural Economics. Ed. Ruth Towse. Cheltenhem, UK: Edward Elgar, 2003. 91-102.

Heilbrun, James and Charles M. Gray. The Economics of Arts and Culture: An American Perspective. New York: Cambridge UP, 1993.

——. The Economics of Arts and Culture. 2nd ed. New York: Cambridge UP, 2001.

Hewett, Ivan. "American Booty." New Statesman 129.4486 (2000): 45.

Hunter, Lynette. "Introduction to Critiques of Knowing." Parallax 5.2 (1999): 121-127.

Ibarra, Maria. Telephone Interview. 3 March 2006.

"Introjection." *Oxford English Dictionary Online*, 2nd Ed. 1989. 1 July 2005. <http://dictionary.oed.com/>.

"International Data on Government Spending on the Arts." National Endowment for the Arts Research Note #74. January 2000.

Ivey, Bill. "America Needs a New System for Supporting the Arts." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 51.22 (2005): B6

Jackson, Maria-Rosario and Joaquin Herranz. Culture Counts in Communities: A Framework for Measurement. Urban Institute. 1 November 2002. 3 March 2004. <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=310834>.

——. "Policy Research on Community Arts: A Collective Endeavor." Community Action Network. 2004. 24 Jan. 2004. <http://www.communityarts.net/readingroom/archive/intro-research.php>.

——. "Why Be Concerned with Artists?" Grantmakers in the Arts Reader. 14.3 (Summer 2003): 13.

Jackson, Maria-Rosario et al. Investing in Creativity: A Study of Support for U.S. Artists. Washington D.C.: Urban Institute, July 2003.

Jacobson, Thomas J. Organizing to Work with CETA. Information Series No. 224. The ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education. Columbus: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Ohio State U., 1981.

Jacoby, Russell. The Last Intellectuals: American Culture in the Age of Academe. New York: Basic, 2000.

Jay, Martin. The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923-1950. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1973.

Jefferson, Margo. "Words to the Wise: Get Help. Collaborate. Grow." New York Times 1 January 2005, final ed.: E:3

Jeffri, Joan. Arts Money: Raising It, Saving It, and Earning It. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1983.

Jensen, Joli. "Expressive Logic: A New Premise in Arts Advocacy." The Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society 33.1 (Spring 2003): 65-80.

——. Is Art Good For Us? Beliefs about High Culture in American Life. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002.

Johnson, Steven, "Friends: Hooking Up." Discover 26.9 (September 2005): 22-23).

Joseph, Miranda. Against the Romance of Community. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2002.

Kammen, Michael. "Culture and the State in America." 1996. The Politics of Culture. Eds. Gigi Bradford, Michael Gary, and Glenn Wallach. New York: The Free Press, 2000. 114-140.

Kelso, John. "Feuding Over Who Started Weirdness." Austin American-Statesman. 3 December 2002, final ed., sec. B:1.

Kester, Grant. "Rhetorical Questions: The Alternative Arts Sector and the Imaginary Public." Art, Activism, and Oppositionality: Essays from Afterimage. Ed. Grant Kester. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1998. 103-135.

Kislan, Richard. The Musical. New York, Applause, 1995.

Kirchberg, Volker. "Structures of Corporate Arts Patronage between the World Wars: a Case Study of the Corporate Leader P.S. du Pont." The Journal of Arts, Management, Law and Society. 33.4 (2004): 263-280.

Kisselgoff, Anna. "Blacks' Realities by Urban Bush Women." New York Times. 25 November 1991, final ed., sec. C: 13.

Klaiman, Gloria. "The Artists Among Us." Night and Day: The Double Lives of Artists in America. Westport, CT: Prager, 2001. 1-8.

Kranzberg, Milton. The Information Age: Evolution or Revolution?" Information Technologies and Social Transformation. Ed. Bruce R. Guile. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Engineering, 1985, 19-47.

Kreidler, John. "Leverage Lost: Evolution in the Nonprofit Arts Ecosystem." The Politics of Culture. Eds. Gigi Bradford, Michael Gary, and Glenn Wallach. New York: The New Press, 2000. 147-168.

Laclau, Ernesto and Chantal Mouffe. Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics. London: Verso, 1985.

Landsman, Aaron. "Fundraising Fundamentals." Creative Capital Professional Development Program. National Performance Network Conference, Miami, FL. 11 December 2005.

Larson, Gary O. American Canvas: An Arts Legacy for our Communities. Washington, DC : National Endowment for the Arts. 1997.

Lerner, Ruby. "Executive Summary." Funding Innovation: An Overview of Creative Capital's First Four Years. 2002 Creative Capital Grantee Report. December, 2002. 15 September 2005. <http://www.creative-capital.org/about/reports/2002-12-fundinginnovation.html>

——. Impersonal Correspondence (Rejection Letter). 20 September 2005.

——. "New School Remarks: Economic Censorship and the Arts." 4 June 2002. 15 September 2005. <http:/www.creative-capital.org/about/reports/2002-0604-newschool.html>.

Leveraging Investments in Creativity (LINC). "About LINC." 1 February 2006. <http://www.lincnet.net/aboutLINC/programs.html>.

——. "Artography: Arts in a Changing America." Unpublished. Undated.

——. "LINC Matters." 1 February 2006. <http://www.lincnet.net/aboutLINC/linc_know_net.html>.

——. "LINC Learning". 12 June 2005. <http://www.lincnet.net/LINClearning/validation.html>.

Levine, Lawrence W. Highbrow/Lowbrow: The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1988.

Levitt, Steven D. and Stephen J. Dubner. Freakonomics. New York: William Morrow, 2005.

Lewis, Justin. Art, Culture and Enterprise: The Politics of Art and the Cultural Industries. London: Routledge, 1990.

Liptak, Adam. "The Ads Discriminate, but Does the Web?" The New York Times. 5 March 2006, late ed., sec. 4: 16+.

Martin, Randy. Review: "Why Are Artists Poor? The Exceptional Economy of the Arts, by Hans Abbing." TDR 47:4 (2003): 192-195.

Martin, Renita. Five Bottles and a Six-Pack. Dir. by Laurie Carlos. Jump-Start Performance Co., San Antonio, TX, 28 May 2005.

Marx Karl and Frederich Engels. The Marx-Engels Reader. Ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. 1971. New York: W.W. Norton, 1978.

McCoy, Horace. They Shoot Horses, Don't They? New York: Simon and Schuster, 1935.

McDonald, Heather. Telephone Interview. 30 March 2006.

McDonald, William F. Federal Relief Administration and the Arts. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1969.

McIntire, Mike. "Enough About 'Gates' as Art: Let's Talk About That Price Tag." New York Times 5 March 2005, late ed.: A1+.

Melzer, Arthur M., Jerry Weinberger, and M. Richard Zinman, eds. Democracy and the Arts. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1999.

Montano, Linda. Performance Artists Talking in the Eighties. Berkeley: U of California P, 2000.

Moore, Steve. Letter. "BREAD SPEAKS." 1 January 2006. 2 April 2006. <http://bread2006.blogspot.com/2006/01/bread-speaks.html>.

Moore, T. "Reasons for Subsidizing American Theater (1968)." The Economics of the Arts. Ed. Mark Blaug. Boulder: Westview, 1976. 25-41.

Morris, Steven Leigh. "The Great White Way." LA Weekly. 27 May 2005: 18.

Moss-Vreeland, Patricia. "Why Invest in Creativity?" Teaching Artist Journal 2.2 (2004): 120-125.

Mouffe, Chantal. "Democratic Citizenship and the Political Community." Dimensions of a Radical Democracy. Ed. Chantal Mouffe. London: Verso, 1992. 225-239.

——. "Hegemony and Ideology in Gramsci." Gramsci and Marxist Ideology. Ed. Chantal Mouffe. London: Routledge & Keegan Paul, 1979. 168-203.

Mulcahey, Kevin V. "Entrepreneurship or Cultural Darwinism? Privatization and American Cultural Patronage." The Journal of Management, Law, and Society 33.3 (2003): 165-184.

National Association of Latino Arts and Cultures (NALAC). Arte y Cultura: El Corazon de las Americas NALAC in the Heartland. Fifth National Conference of the National Association of Latino Arts and Culture, 6-10 October 2004.

——. *Crossing Borders/Cruzando Fronteras: Los Siguentes 500 Años/The Next 500 Years*. Conference Proceedings, 1992.

——. *El Aviso*. 5.1 (2004).

——. *Latino Arts and Cultural Organizations in the United States: A Historical Survey and Current Assessment*, 1998.

——. "Mission and History." Handout, 2006.

National Endowment for the Arts. RFP for Grants in First Round of Fiscal Year Funding, Jan. 2004. 24 Jan. 2004. <http://www.arts.gov/grants/apply/GAP05/index.html>.

National Performance Network (NPN). *Directory*. New Orleans, 2006.

——. 21st Annual Meeting. Miami, FL, 8-12 December 2005.

——. 20th Annual Meeting. Los Angeles, CA, 3-7 December 2004.

——. 19th Annual Meeting. Chicago, IL, 15-19 November 2003

——. 18th Annual Meeting. Washington, D.C., 14-18 December 2002.

"Need." *Oxford English Dictionary Online*, 2nd Ed. 1989. 1 July 2005. <http://dictionary.oed.com/>.

Nesbitt, Caroline. "Double Dose of One-Acts at Theater Offensive." The Boston Globe. 15 June 2000, final ed., sec. D: 5.

Nesti, Robert. "Theater Offensive Duo Gets Split Decision." Boston Herald. 14 June 2000 all ed., Arts & Life: 61.

"Network" *Oxford English Dictionary Online*, 2nd Ed. 1989. 1 July 2005. <http://dictionary.oed.com/>.

Netzer, Dick. The Subsidized Muse: Public Support for the Arts in the United States. New York: Cambridge UP, 1978.

Nicholas, Ted. Non-Profit Tax Exempt Corporations: The Alternative Tax Shelter. Wilmington, DE: Enterprise Publishing, Inc., 1980.

Nunberg, Geoffrey. "The Entrepreneurial Spirit." *Fresh Air* Commentary. Natl. Public Radio. KSTX, San Antonio. 28 October 2000. 1 July 2005. Transcript. <http://www-csli.stanford.edu/%7Enunberg/entrepreneur.html.>

O'Hagan, John W. The State and the Arts: An Analysis of Key Economic Policy Issue in Europe and the United States. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 1998.

"On Money." Theatre 27.1 (1996): 84-95.

Ortiz, Amalia. Telephone Interview. 31 March 2006.

Pick, John. Arts Administration. London: E. & F. N. Spon, 1980.

Pogrebin, Robin. "Report Says Artists' Arrival Can Push Out Neighbors." The New York Times 11 Nov. 2002, B1 +4.

Pollack, Sydney, dir. They Shoot Horses, Don't They? Prod. Robert Chartoff and Irwin Winkler. Palomar Pictures, 1969.

Pottenger, Marty. NPN 18th Annual Meeting, Washington D.C. 17 December 2002.

President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities. "Creative America: A Report to the President." The Politics of Culture. Eds. Gigi Bradford, Michael Gary, and Glenn Wallach. New York: The New Press, 2000. 71-78.

Pryor, Jaclyn. Artist Interview. 18 February 2006.

——. BREAD. Austin, TX, 31 December 2005.

——. BREAD*: A Public Ritual of Hope Commissioned by First Night Austin*. 7 December 2005. 31 December 2005. < http://bread2006.blogspot.com/>.

——. "BREAD SPEAKS." 1 January 2006. 5 January 2006. <http://bread2006.blogspot.com/2006/01/bread-speaks.html>.

——. “The Bakers.” 20 December 2006. 5 January 2006. <http://bread2006.blogspot.com/2005/12/bakers.html>.

Renaud-Gonzalez, Barbara. “Las True Stories.” 2 March 2006. 30 March 2006. <http://barbararenaud.blogspot.com/2006_03_01_barbararenaud_archive.html>.

Román, David. Acts of Intervention: Performance, Gay Culture and AIDS. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1998.

Roseberry, William. “Marxism and Culture.” The Politics of Culture. Ed. Brett Williams. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991. 19-43.

Rothfield, Laurence. Cultural Policy Studies?! Cultural Policy Studies?! Cultural Policy Studies?! A Guide for Perplexed Humanists. Working Paper. The Cultural Policy Center. The U of Chicago, April 1999.

Schechner, Richard. Performance Theory. Taylor and Francis: London, 2003.

Schulman, Sarah. My American History: Lesbian and Gay Life During the Reagan Bush Years. (New York: Routledge, 1994).

Schuster, J. Mark. “Who Should Pay (for the Arts and Culture)? Who Should Decide? And What Difference Should It Make?” Unsettling “Sensation”: Arts-Policy Lessons from the Brooklyn Museum of Arts Controversy. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 2001. 72-89.

——. “The Other Side of the Subsidized Muse.” Journal of Cultural Economics 23 (1999): 51-70.

Seaman, Bruce. “Arts Impact Studies: A Fashionable Excess.” The Politics of Culture. 1987. Eds. Gigi Bradford, Michael Gary, and Glenn Wallach. New York: The Free Press, 2000. 266-285.

——. “National Investment in the Arts” Issue Paper. Washington, DC: Center for Arts and Culture. 2000. 24 Jan. 2004. <http://www.culturalpolicy.org/pdf/investment.pdf>

Shaw, Peggy and Lois Weaver. Personal Interview. 21 April 2005.

Shaw, Steven A. “Tipped Off.” New York Times 10 January 2005, late ed.: A:21.

Silber, Norman O. A Corporate Form of Freedom: The Emergence of the Modern Nonprofit Sector. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2001.

Silva, Elda. “Guadalupe Center Gets Called Out” San Antonio Express-News 24 March 2006, final ed., sec. A:1+.

Silver, A. David. Strategic Partnering. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1993.

Slaughter, Louise. “Promoting the Arts: Promoting the General Welfare.” The Philosophical Society of Texas Proceedings 1997. Austin, TX: The Philosophical Society of Texas, 2000. 9-24.

Smith, James Allen. “Preface.” The Politics of Culture: Policy Perspectives for Individuals, Institutions, and Communities. New York: The New P, 2000. ix-xi.

——. “Why Art? Why Economics” What Does Economics Have to Do with Culture?” GIA Reader 14.2 (Summer 2003): 22-23.

Stewart, Kathleen. “Nostalgia—A Polemic.” Cultural Anthropology 3.3 (1988): 227-241.

Strom, Elizabeth. Strengthening Communities Through Culture. Pittsburgh: Center for Arts and Culture, 2001.

Strouse, Jean. Morgan: An American Financier (NewYork: Random House, 2000).

"Support." *Oxford English Dictionary Online*, 2nd Ed. 1989. 1 July 2005. <http://dictionary.oed.com/>.

Tallack, Douglas. Twentieth-Century America: The Intellectual and Cultural Context. London: Longman, 1991.

Tepper, Stephen J. "The Cultural Wars: A Reassessment." Policy brief for *Art, Culture and the National Agenda* project. Princeton, NJ: Center for Arts and Culture, 1999. 12 May 2003. <http://www.princeton.edu/culturalpolicy/occaspap.html>.

Throsby, C. D. "Artists as Workers." Cultural Economics. Ed Ruth Towse and Abdul Khakee. Berlin: Springer-Berlag, 1992. 201-208.

Throsby, C. D. and G. A. Withers. The Economics of the Performing Arts. New York: St. Martin's, 1979.

Throsby, David. "Cultural Capital." *Journal of Cultural Economics* 23(1999): 3-12.

——. "Disaggregated Earning Functions for Artists." Economics of the Arts. Eds. V.A. Ginsburgh and P. M. Mengers. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1996. 331-346.

——. Economics and Culture. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 2001.

Toffler, Alvin. The Culture Consumers: A Study of Art and Affluence in America. New York: St. Martin's P, 1964.

Towse, Ruth. "Introduction." A Handbook of Cultural Economics. Ed. Ruth Towse. Cheltenhem, UK: Edward Elgar, 2003. 1-15.

Townsend, Helen. "The Social Origins of the Federal Art Project." Art, Ideology, and Politics. Ed. Judith H. Balfe and Margaret Jane Wyszomirski. New York: Praeger, 1985. 264-292.

Urban Institute. "About UI." 2006. 9 April 2006. <http://www.urban.org/about/index.cfm>.

- - -. *American Perceptions of Artists* Survey. 2001. 18 January 2006. <http://cpanda.org/arts-culture-facts/audiences /apa02.html>).

van Dijk, Jan A.G.M. "The One-dimensional Network Society of Manuel Castells." New Media and Society 1.1 (1999). 21-32.

Van Ryzin, Jeanne-Clare. "First Night: Ten Years in the Making, Austin's New Year's Party is Ready to Astound and You're Invited." Austin American-Statesman. 29 December 2005, sec. XL ENT: 22.

Volisinov, V.N. "Concerning the Relation of the Basis and the Superstructure." Marxism and the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1973. 17-24.

Wallach, Glenn. "Introduction." The Politics of Culture: Policy Perspectives for Individuals, Institutions, and Communities. New York: The New P, 2000. 1-9.

Wegman, M.K. Introduction. 21st NPN Annual Meeting. Miami, FL. 8 December 2005.

——. Introduction. 19th NPN Annual Meeting. Chicago, IL. 15 November 2003.

Weisberger, Bernard A. "Federal Art for Whose Sake?" American Heritage 43.8 (December 1992): 20-21.

"Wildly Guessing the Price of 'The Gates.'" New York Times 4 March 2005. 5 March 2005. <http://www.nytimes.com/imagepages/2005/03/04/nyregion/20050305_gates_graphic.html>.

Williams, Brett. "Introduction." The Politics of Culture. Ed. Brett Williams. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991. 1-18.

Williams, Raymond. Culture and Society: 1780-1950. London: Chatto & Windus, 1959.

——. Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society, Revised Ed. New York: Oxford UP, 1983.

——. Marxism and Literature. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1977.

Windolf, Paul. Corporate Networks in Europe and the United States. New York: Oxford UP, 2002.

Witham, Barry. The Federal Theater Project: A Case Study. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 2003.

Wyszomirski, Margaret Jane. "Policy Communities and Policy Influence: Securing a Government Role in Cultural Policy for the Twenty-First Century." 1995. The Politics of Culture. Eds. Gigi Bradford, Michael Gary, and Glenn Wallach. New York: The New Press, 2000. 94-107.

——. "Raison d'Etat, Raison des Arts: Thinking about Public Purposes." The Public Life of Arts in America. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 2000. 50-78.

——. "Sources of Private Support for the Arts: An Overview." The Costs of Culture: Patterns and Prospects of Private Arts Patronage. New York: ACA Books, 1989. 1-8.

Zarsky, Mimi. Personal Email. 11 November 2005.

Zeigler, Joseph Wesley. Arts in Crisis: The National Endowment for the Arts Versus America. Chicago: A Cappella Books, 1994.

Zinn, Howard. A People's History of the United States, 20th Ed. New York: Harper-Collins, 1999.

VITA

Paul André Bonin (aka Paul Bonin-Rodriguez) is the son of María Sylvia Rodriguez Bonin and Charles Edward Bonin. For twenty years, he has worked as an independent performing artist, first as a dancer, and later as a writer-performer, choreographer, and director. He can be located through his website www.paulbonin-rodriguez.com.

Permanent address: 110 Blue Star, San Antonio, TX 78204

This dissertation was typed by the author.